The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

ATTRACTION OF MOOD IN EARLY LATIN

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE, IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY

TENNEY FRANK

CHICAGO
1904

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

3781
C53F

UNCLASSED
Dissertation

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

ATTRACTION OF MOOD IN EARLY LATIN

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY
TENNEY FRANK

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.
1904

ATTRACTION OF MOOD IN EARLY LATIN.

INTRODUCTION.

Notwithstanding the great activity of scholars in the field of Latin syntax during the last half century, the subject of attraction of mood in the Latin language has passed almost unnoticed. The reason is not that the subject is already clearly understood. On the contrary, most of the statements in regard to it in the handbooks are, at least in part, erroneous, and confessedly are based upon very meager data. Neither is it a matter of small importance; for at few points does fine feeling for the shades of meaning of moods more affect the interpretation of a Latin sentence than in the usages of this construction. Nevertheless it has been slighted. I find but one treatment of the subject that pretends in any way to be thoroughgoing. Even this touches a very limited field, namely a part of Cicero; does not get complete data from this; makes little attempt at digesting the material gathered; and uses a method of treatment which is somewhat antiquated. I refer to the program of Franz Peters,[1] published in 1861. The substance of his treatise may be found in Draeger,[2] whose lists are as full and valuable as any yet published on the subject. Draeger's examples are taken mainly from Cicero. The same is true of Kühner's examples.[3] Ziemer[4] should also be mentioned for some suggestive remarks on the subject.

Several dissertations upon special constructions have of necessity touched upon the subject in passing, but have hardly affected the discussion of the problem, since they have approached it only

[1] De attractione quadam temporum ac modorum linguae latinae. Progr., Deutsch-Crone, 1861.

[2] Historische Syntax der Lat. Sprache, I, sec. 151, 2–5.

[3] Lat. Grammatik, II, 2.

[4] Junggrammatische Streifzüge; Colberg, 1883.

from the point of view of their special topic. Thus Lübbert[1] places certain cum-clauses in Plautus under the category of attraction. Elste,[2] Richardson[3] and Boettger[4] explain certain examples of the subjunctive with dum as due to the same influence. Schubert,[5] Lange[6] and Rodenbusch[7] should also be mentioned as having touched the subject incidentally, the latter two at least with some insight. The lists of Holtze,[8] which are supposed to cover the field of Early Latin, are not half complete, constantly betray a lack of understanding of Early Latin usage, and make no analysis of the material. Nevertheless they have been of value as presenting the largest collection of such material from that important period. To all of the above I have given due credit where they have been found serviceable.

My attention was first called to this subject by Professor Hale, who in several of his works has thrown new light upon the obscure problem. References to these will be found in the body of this treatise, in which it will become apparent how great is my indebtedness to him, not only for specific suggestions, but also for my point of view, method, and even grammatical nomenclature and classification. In saying this, however, I do not wish to be understood as implying that Professor Hale agrees with me in the interpretation of every example, nor in all of my reasoning.

As regards my way of approaching the subject, it may be said that, after working for a considerable time over the whole range of Latin literature, I discovered that I was dealing with a changing construction, and that, therefore, a historical treatment was the only logical one. Furthermore, it became apparent that the origins of the use of the subjunctive by attraction are not to be looked for in the language of artistic prose, with its various conscious artifices; for the construction appears before the time of such writing, and in simpler form. On the other hand, since the

[1] Die Syntax von Quom, 1870, cf. p. 125 ff.
[2] De Dum Particulae Usu Plautino, 1882.
[3] De Dum Particulae apud Prisc. Scr. Lat., 1886.
[4] De Dum Particulae Usu apud Terentium et in Rel. Trag. et Com., 1887.
[5] Zum Gebrauch der Temporalconjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881.
[6] De Sententiarum Temporalium apud Prisc. Scr. Lat. Syntaxi, 1878.
[7] De Temporum Usu Plautino, 1888.
[8] Syntaxis Prisc. Scr. Lat., 1861; and Syntaxis Frag. Scaen. Poet Rom., 1882.

construction, in the very nature of the case, belongs to hypotaxis and a fairly well developed complex sentence, we need not become involved in the mists of parataxis. Early Latin, as we have it, may therefore confidently be called on to explain the beginnings. I have accordingly tried to make a thorough survey of Early Latin down to Lucretius. From the point of view thus gained I propose in a second paper to sketch the later usage of the construction. The so-called construction of " attraction by the infinitive " has some things in common with the one here treated, but since the data offered by early Latin are too meager to ensure safe generalization, I propose to postpone its discussion to a later paper in which I intend to use statistics gathered from classical authors as well. The field covered by this paper includes Plautus,[1] Terence, Cato, the early dramatic fragments, which are found in Ribbeck's[2] collection, and the remaining fragments of the early Roman poets, which are found in the sixth volume of Baehrens'[3] collection. I have, with few exceptions, adopted the text as given in the editions named. The lists of examples being large, the errors are likely to balance one another. On the other hand, the discussion of all examples for which the manuscript readings vary would swell the work to impossible limits.

My treatment falls under two heads: (1) the sources of the construction; (2) the uses[4] of the construction.

[1] I have used the following editions: for Plautus, that of Götz and Schöll, Leipzig, 1893–1898; for Terence, that of Dziatzko, Leipzig, 1884; for Cato's Agri Cultura, that of Keil, Leipzig, 1894; for the fragments of Cato, that of Jordan, Leipzig, 1860.

[2] Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, Leipzig, 1896–7.

[3] Poetae Latini Minores, VI, Leipzig, 1885.

[4] I regret to say that I have not been able to avail myself of a study upon the same subject which was announced after my paper had gone to print. I refer to the paper of F. Antoine (L'Attraction modale en Latin, Mélanges Boissier, Paris, Fontemoing). Judging by the accurate and sane work of that scholar, I feel that the loss to my study must be great indeed; and I can only make it good by referring the reader to his work which may supplement and correct the views expressed by mine.

CHAPTER I.

The Sources of the Construction.

A number of years ago Professor Hale pointed out the way in which the origins of the construction now under examination must be studied. He says in his 'Sequence of Tenses' (*American Journal of Philology,* VIII [1888], 1, p. 54; and *American Journal of Philology,* IX [1889], 2, pp. 175–6): "In complex sentences made up of a main sentence with subjunctive verb and one or more subordinate sentences, the modal feeling in the speaker's mind which expresses itself in the main sentence is, in the nature of things, very likely to continue in the speaker's mind in the subordinated sentence or sentences, either quite unchanged or but slightly shaded. If, for example, I say in Latin, 'Let him send whom he will,' *mittat quem velit,* the mood in *velit* is not a case of '*attraction*' or '*assimilation*' at all. *Velit* is as much a jussive as *mittat* is. The meaning is, 'Let him choose his man, and send that man'; or, in older English, 'Choose he his man and send him.' In *sei ques esent quei sibei deicerent necesus ese Bacanal habere* (C. I. L., I, 196), the *deicerent* is as much a future condition (= *sei ques deicerent*) as *esent* is." Again, "the frequent recurrence of such examples *gives rise* to the occasional use of a dependent subjunctive with only a formal likeness to the main subjunctive, and no true modal feeling." Later he reiterates the statement in a paper on the Anticipatory Subjunctive[1] (p. 63, footnote).

This wording implies, of course, that the construction in question is a thing *brought about* and *developed.* As for Professor Hale's interpretation of the mood of *velit* and *deicerent,* there can be no dispute, and it is my belief that, in the other main divisions of the subjunctive also, a great number of the cases usually treated as examples of attraction are to be interpreted in the same

[1] University of Chicago Press, 1894. Reprinted in Studies in Classical Philology of the University of Chicago, Vol. I, 1895.

way; and that these must be distinguished from those which are in reality due to the *habit* of attraction pure and simple. The distinction might well be expressed in the terms of Professor Hale, who speaks of the mood of "like feeling" and that of "formal likeness."[1]

We are to seek, then, for combinations in which the modal feeling expressed by the main verb may naturally cast its shadow over the subjunctive clause. Obviously, there would be a limited number of conditions under which this is possible.

The conditions are favorable when both the verbs (main and subordinate) are in the same grammatical tense, and are placed in the same actual time-sphere. Such a state of affairs may be illustrated by the examples above, or by Aul. 491, *quo lubeant,* nubant, "let them marry where they please," i. e., "let them choose their place, and marry there."

These clauses occur freely in dependence upon subjunctives of "volition," "wish," "permission" and the like. I add further illustrations:

With a subjunctive of permission:

Bacch. 656, furetur *quod queat,* "let him steal what he can" ("what he shall be able to steal").

With a subjunctive of wish:

Hec. 197, di uortant bene *quod agas,* "May the gods further what you do" ("shall do").

With a substantive volitive clause:

Bacch. 674, occasio . . . fuit . . . ut *quantum uelles* tantum sumeres, "there was opportunity to take as much as you wished" ("as much as you should wish").

The conditions are less favorable when the subjunctive verb, though in the same grammatical tense, is not in the same time-sphere as that of the main clause. An example may be seen in Cas. 252, iam domuisti animum . . . ut, quod uir uelit fieri, id facias? "have you brought your mind to do (i. e., *will* you do?) that which your husband desires?"

Between the more favorable conditions and the less favorable lie the conditions in which it is impossible to tell from the context whether the subordinate verb is in the same time-sphere with

[1] A. J. P., Vol. IX, p. 176.

the main verb, or, though grammatically in the same tense, is *not* in the same time-sphere,—or, to state the matter in another way, the conditions in which *either* relation is reasonable, and there is nothing to determine which is meant. Such a state of things may be seen in Epid. 283, iam igitur amota ei fuerit omnis consultatio nuptiarum, ne grauetur quod uelis, "dismiss at once then the whole question of marriage, lest he shall begrudge you what you wish." Either "wish" or "shall wish" is here reasonable, and nothing in the context bars either meaning. Such combinations formed a bridge from the use of the subjunctive of "like feeling" to the use of the subjunctive of "formal likeness" in the dependent clause, and thus carried the mood over from its original domain in the former field to a new domain in the latter.

Distinctly unfavorable are the conditions when there is a shift in tense as well as in time-sphere, as when a verb in the past depends grammatically upon a future verb of willing or wishing, as in Cas. 503, ut *quod mandaui* curet, "that he may execute the commissions which I have given"; or, to take a subjunctive, in Rud. 1243, ut cum maiore dote abeat *quam aduenerit,* "that she may depart with a larger dowry than she brought with her." Here *aduenerit,* a verb of past time, could not share in the future volitive idea expressed by the mood and tense of *abeat.* In sentences of this type, then, is found the extreme of the fully developed habit of attraction.

With this preliminary explanation, we pass to an enumeration and discussion of the various kinds of subjunctives after which the verb of the dependent clause is at times found to contain the same modal feeling as that of the main clause ("subjunctive *of like feeling*").

I find these kinds to be as follows:[1]

1. Volitive Subjunctive
   - Jussive and Permissive.
   - "Deliberative" and its extensions (Subjunctive of Surprise or Indignation).
   - Dependent Volitive.

[1] The order in this list is that of the treatment which follows, and is determined by practical considerations of exposition.

2. Optative Subjunctive—independent and dependent.

3. Subjunctive of Obligation or Propriety.

4. Anticipatory Subjunctive, for the present or the past (present-future or past-future).

5. Conditional Subjunctive.

6. Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty (as in Subjunctive Conclusions).

7. Subjunctive in Indirect Questions.

A.

Subjunctives depending upon subjunctives with simple volitive or optative force have been sufficiently treated above (pp. 5–6).

B.

The clauses which depend upon a subjunctive of "surprise or indignation," though of volitive ("deliberative") origin, may well be treated in a separate paragraph, since they show some important peculiarities. Through the very nature of this construction, it matters little whether the main and the dependent verbs are in the same time-sphere; for surprise or indignation is expressed as readily at an act that took place in the past as at one of the present time. Ordinarily, in this group, it is easy to tell from the context whether the secondary verb has naturally the feeling of the main verb. The following sentence affords a good illustration of this class: Phorm. 970–3, ubi *quae* lubitum *fuerit* peregre *feceris* neque huius *sis ueritus* feminae primariae, . . . uenias nunc precibus lautum peccatum tuom!

The mood of *uenias* expresses the speaker's (feigned) indignation. That same feeling extends,[1] it seems to me, through *feceris,* and *sis ueritus,* since these dwell upon the very acts which caused the anger. It probably does not extend into the explanatory clause *quae lubitum fuerit,* or, if it does, it extends with far less force. I should say that *feceris* and *sis ueritus* are in the subjunctive for the same reason that *uenias* is, but that *lubitum fuerit*

[1] In the following examples, in which the main verbs are in the indicative, I should prefer to interpret the dependent subjunctives as due to indignation and surprise rather than to an adversative feeling.

Pers. 76, sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam *ubi sint* magistratus quos curare oporteat!

is a case of attraction. This statement may become clearer if we compare the following sentence, in which the explanatory clause, which is much like the one just discussed, is left in the indicative:

Men. 560, Egone hic me patiar in matrimonio
Ubi uir compilet clanculum *quicquid domist?*

In the following the subordinate verbs are, if my interpretation is right, in the subjunctive, not by mechanical attraction, but

Pseud. 184, Eo uost uostros panticesque adeo madefactatis *quom ego sim* hic siccus! Here Lange (De Sententiarum Temporalium apud Prisc. Scr. Lat. Syntaxi, p. 45) needlessly proposes to emend *madefactatis* to *madefaciatis*, in order to get a raison d'être for the mood of *sim*.

Capt. 892, dubium habebis etiam, sancte *quom ego iurem* tibi!

In the first of these examples the force is not felt with such strength, at the moment when *sum* and *curo* are uttered, as to call for the subjunctive; but the speaker's indignation rises as he proceeds, and finds full expression in *sint* and *oporteat*. I would add to this list Ad. 166, noui ego uostra haec "nollem factum, dabitur ius iurandum, indignum te esse iniuria hac," indignis *quom* egomet *sim acceptus* modis. The tone of the last clearly is "to think of coming with such excuses, *after I have been abused in this way*!" Lange (ibid., p. 43) goes far afield in saying that the mood of the cum-clause is due to its dependence upon the infinitive, and Lübbert (Die Syntax von Quom, p. 140) makes it one of the two clauses in Terence which are in this mood because of a causal *quom*. If we are right in recognizing this force in the dependent temporal clauses above (with a main verb in the indicative), we shall also recognize it when a subjunctive clause with ubi or cum is found in dependence upon a subjunctive; for the existence of such clauses after an indicative proves that those which we find after a subjunctive are not necessarily in that mood because of attraction, but possibly by their own inherent force. I should likewise suggest that many of the so-called causal and adversative *qui*-clauses in Plautus and Terence should rather be explained as due to the presence of this other force. For, if we are right in recognizing the subjunctive of surprise or indignation after a cum (cf. Bacch. 1192, Egon *quom* haec cum illo *accubet inspectem*?) and ubi (Epid. 588, Non patrem ego te nominem *ubi* tu tuam me *appelles* filiam?), we should naturally do so after *qui* in clauses of the same nature, as in Pers. 27, deisne aduorser quasi Titani, cum eis belligerem, quibus sat esse *non queam*! and in Rud. 1244, Egone ut *quod* ad me allatum esse alienum *sciam celem*? Note how closely, in the two examples following, the qui-clause and the cum-clause correspond: M. G. 964, Vah, egone ut ad te ab libertina esse auderem internuntius, qui ingenuis satis responsare *nequeas*! Most. 896, Tibi obtemperem *quom* tu mihi *nequeas*!

I do not wish to be understood as giving my assent to the view adopted by Dittmar, Lateinische Modus-Lehre, a view credited to Luchs by Guthmann (Über eine Art unwilliger Fragen, Nürnberg, 1891, p. 1; see also Stolz-Schmalz Gram. [1900] p. 370), that this force was the origin of the subjunctive in qui-causal clauses. An examination of all the data will disprove the

because of their own inherent force of surprise, indignation, or the like. Thus, the first of the following examples is practically equal to: Haec cum illo *accubet,* et ego *inspectem!* cf. Cic. Cat. 2, 8, 18, tu rebus omnibus *copiosus sis,* et *dubites!* "You a man provided with everything,—and you hesitate!" [1]

With quom:

Bacch. 1192, Egon, *quom* haec cum illo *accubet,* inspectem?

Most. 896, Tibi obtemperem, *quom* tu mihi *nequeas?*

Heaut. 413–15, Verum *quom uideam* miserum hunc tam excruciarier eius abitu, celem tam insperatum gaudium *quom* illi pericli nil ex indicio *siet?*

Hec. 341, Non uisam uxorem Pamphili, *quom* in proximo hic *sit* aegra?

Andr. 944, Egon huius memoriam patiar meae uoluptati obstare, *quom* ego *possim* in hac re medicari mihi!

Bacch. 285, Adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem,

> *Quom* mi ipsum nomen eius Archidemides
> *Clamaret* dempturum esse!

With ubi temporal:

Epid. 588, Non patrem te nominem, *ubi* tu tuam me *appelles* filiam?

Men. 560–1, Egone hic me patiar in matrimonio,
> *Ubi* uir *compilet* clanculum quidquid domist
> Atque ea ad amicam *deferat?*

Ubi local:

Bacch. 1190, Egon, ubi filius *corrumpatur* meus, ibi potem?

I should add to this list, for reasons given in the footnote (p.

theory. One of the numerous weaknesses in Dittmar's general procedure lies in the fact that his theories are bolstered up by a few cleverly chosen examples which are interpreted to suit the theory in question. As for the interpretation of the cum-clauses given at the beginning of this note, I am well aware of the fact that it is by no means certain. It may be that all of the subjunctives with cum in Plautus and Terence (outside of cases of attraction or indirect discourse) are due to unconscious corruption on the part of copyists who were following the usage of their own times. Cf. Hale, Cum-Constructions, p. 211. *Ubi sint* of Pers. 76 may likewise be adversative.

[1] This is classed in the Hale-Buck Grammar, § 503, as illustrating the extreme development from the volitive question. It is ordinarily classed as a Potential subjunctive.

8), the qui causal-adversative clauses which show the same force. Cf. Asin. 838,

An tu me tristem putas?
Putem ego *quem uideam* aeque esse maestum ut quasi dies si dicta sit?

C.

Akin to the subjunctive of indignation in feeling, though of a different origin,[1] is that which expresses "obligation or propriety," and I accordingly treat it next. In Hec. 658, nunc, *quom* eius alienum a me esse animum *sentiam*, . . . quam ob rem redducam? the main verb asks a question of propriety in a tone of surprise, which latter feeling has full possession of the subordinate verb and makes it subjunctive. The same is true in Eun. 566, quid ego eius tibi nunc faciem praedicem aut laudem, Antipho, *quom* ipsus me *noris* quam elegans formarum spectator siem?

Again, I should add to this list many of the so-called qui-causal clauses which may be interpreted as expressing the same feeling, and depend upon verbs in the subjunctive of propriety. So, for instance, I do not see why subjunctives like the following, with qui, should be placed in a different class from those just cited with quom:

M. G. 426, Quin ego hoc rogem *quod nesciam!*
M. G. 556, Vidi: cur negem *quod uiderim!*
Amph. 434, Quid ego ni negem *qui* egomet *siem!*

The number of these examples in Plautus and Terence is large.

There are also certain subordinate clauses depending upon verbs like *mereo*, which belong to this group. Thus in Men. 1067, non edepol ita promeruisti de me ut pigeat *quae uelis*, "you have deserved better of me than that you should express a wish and be disappointed," I should say that the mood of *uelis* is not due to attraction, but conveys the idea of propriety quite as clearly as *pigeat* does. The feeling of remonstrance is also strong in the cum-clauses of the following, in which *ut siet* must be classed as a substantive clause of propriety (I should not, with Lübbert, p. 81, take the Subjunctives with cum as due to mechanical attraction):

[1] Cf. Hale, Proceedings Am. Phil. As., Vol. 32 [1901], p. 120.

Bacch. 140–2,

> Non par uidetur neque sit consentaneum,
> *Quom* haec intus intus *sit* et cum amica *accubet,*
> *Quomque osculetur* et conuiuae alii *accubent,*
> Praesentibus illis paedagogus una ut siet.

In none of the above, then, is the dependent clause mechanically attracted. It may be said to be in the subjunctive because it is within the penumbra of the subjunctive shadow extended by the main verb. And it seems highly probable that the mechanical habit of assimilation was helped on by the occurrence of a great number of such instances.

D.

The part played by the anticipatory subjunctive[1] is probably the most important of all in the creation of this construction. In the first place, all futures, when thrown into the past, of necessity are expressed by the subjunctive.[2]

Epid. 501, Conducta ueni ut fidibus cantarem seni dum rem diuinam *faceret.*

In which faceret represents a future *dum faciet* projected into the past. Contrast:

Epid. 47, Ipse mandauit . . . ut fidicina quam *amabat* emeretur sibi,

in which *amabat* represents a present *amat* thrown into past discourse. Other examples of the past future are:

[1] The existence of such a type of the Subjunctive is now coming to be generally recognized. See Hale's "The Sequence of Tenses" A. J. P., VIII (1887) p. 48 (act "in view"); Rodenbusch, De Temporum Usu Plautino, 1888; Sonnenschein, Cl. Rev., vol. VII, Feb. (1893); Hale, Cl. Rev. vol. VIII, April (1894), and Anticipatory Subjunctive, 1894; Schmalz, Lat. Gram. (1900) p. 370; Blase, Hist. Lat. Gram. (1903) III, p. 124.

[2] See the Hale-Buck Latin Grammar, § 508–9, and Hale's Anticipatory Subjunctive, p. 64, footnote. It is customary, of course, to treat the mood in such cases as due to attraction, or, if after verbs "sentiendi et declarandi," as due to indirectness of discourse. So Lübbert treats Amph. 128, and Bacch. 955 (cf. pp. 86 and 93). Holtze's treatment is similar. See pp. 192–5 passim. It must be understood, however, that the verbs in such cases could not have been in the indicative, and therefore it is impossible to say that they have been attracted. They are, as explained in the Supplement to the Hale-Buck Grammar, not *due to* the habit of using the subjunctive, but factors *contributing to bring about* that habit.

Pseud. 57, Ea causa miles hic reliquit symbolum . . .
ut qui huc *adferret* eius similem symbolum
cum eo simul me mitteret.
Amph. 128, ut ne qui essem familiares quaererent
uorsari crebro hic quom *uiderent* me domi.

Cf. also Epid. 316, faceret; Epid. 356, redisses; Epid. 386, inspexissent; Amph. 83–4, mandasset, fecisset; Amph. 225, uicti sint; Bacch. 955, scinderetur; Trin. 1144, darem; 314, esset; Adel. 109, eiecisset; Hec. 545, egissem; Curc. 346, attulisset.

It is not a great step from sentences like these to the following, in which one cannot be positive whether the original verb of the dependent clause was a future or a present: Bacch. 550, ille . . . accuratum habuit quod *posset* mali faceret in me. Cf. 554. Here posset could stand for either potero or possum. From such examples the step is short to the use of the imperfect subjunctive for a dependent clause thrown from the *present* into the past. Cf. Merc. 152, me rupi causa currendo tua ut *quae scirem* scire actutum tibi liceret; Bacch. 788, orabat *quod* istic *esset scriptum* ut fieret. To such cases it is correct to apply the word *attraction,* since the verbs could be in the indicative if emphasis required it. Cf. Eun. 574, (ut) . . . essem una quacum cupiebam.

In the second place, our study of early Latin seems to bear out the belief of Professor Hale[1] that " in such a case as *di tibi dent quaequomque optes* (' the gods grant you whatever your heart *shall* wish '), Plaut., As. 44, we have the descendant of an original determinative anticipatory clause." " I have long believed," Professor Hale says,[2] " that the anticipatory subjunctive supplies a large factor to the development of this construction (attraction). Especially in Plautus and Terence, a considerable proportion of the subjunctives of ' assimilation ' after primary tenses seem easily to be accounted for as simply anticipatory, if we assume that the anticipatory power still remained to the mood at that time. This has been shown to be the case for Terence, in a paper written for the degree of A.B. by Mr. F. O. Bates, a student of mine at Cornell, in the year 1891–2."

[1] Antic. Subj., p. 63, footnote.
[2] Ibid., p. 64, footnote.

An examination of the expressions of this kind in early Latin certainly gives strength to the belief that the anticipatory power still persisted in them, though the Roman grammarians, like the modern, may have lost sight of the origin and referred the mode to "attraction." The case of dum, meaning "while" and "as long as" and pointing to the future, furnishes a good illustration. Whenever its clause is subjunctive in early Latin and depends upon a subjunctive, it is the practice to say that the mood is due to attraction. In this way Boettger (De Dum Particulae Usu, etc., p. 20) explains dum-clauses in the following: habet haec ei quod *dum uiuat* usque ad aurem obganniat, Phorm. 1030; ita uelim me promerentem ames, dum uiuas, mi pater, ut me . . . dolet? Adel. 681; and ut dum uiuat meminerit semper mei, Heaut. 951. In the same way the dum-clauses in the following are explained by Elste (De Dum Particulae Usu Plautino, p. 26): quid dotis? egone; ut semper, dum uiuat, me alat, Curc. 664; neu sessum ducat, dum histrio in scaena siet, Poen. 20; faciam ut mei memineris, dum uitam uiuas, Pers. 495; quaeso dum uiuas uti omnes tui similes hospites habeas tibi, Rud. 499. And Richardson (De Dum Particulae apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos Usu, p. 72) similarly explains the dependent clause in Epid. 501, which is a sentence of the same kind, in dependence upon a verb in the past. But the occurrence of subjunctives after dum with the same meaning, which do not depend upon subjunctives and which clearly show anticipatory force, proves that the cases just mentioned should be considered as instances of the anticipatory subjunctive. The following will illustrate what I mean:

Truc. 716, Ego† interim hic restiti tricis praesidebo
iste dum *sic faciat* domum ad te exagogam.

Cf. *τόφρα . . . κτήματ' ἔδονται ὄφρα κε κείνη τοῦτον ἔχῃ νόον.* β 123.
ὄφρ' ἂν μέν κεν δούρατ' ἐν ἁρμονίῃσιν ἀρήρῃ, τόφρ' αὐτοῦ μενέω. ε 361.

Truc. 103, Oenus eorum aliquis† oculum amicae
usque oggerit dum illi *agant.*

The same subjunctive with other particles is illustrated by the following:

Amph. 439: ubi ego Sosia *nolim* esse, tu esto sane Sosia.[1]

[1] This interpretation is given by Lange, De Sententiarum Temporalium apud Prisc. Scr. Lat. Syntaxi, p. 41.

Cf. *ἐπὴν δή μοι σχεδίην διὰ χῦμα τινάξῃ, νήξομαι.* ε 363.

See also in Umbrian: pone esonome ferar . . . ere fertu— Iguv. Tab.[1] VIb, 50, which Bücheler translates: cum in rem divinam feretur . . . is ferto.

Trin. 1131, id repetundi copiast quando *uelis*.

Blase[2] goes so far even as to accept Rodenbusch's explanation of the subjunctive for the following independent sentences in Plautus:

Amph. 1060: Nec me miserior feminast neque ulla *uideatur* magis.

Truc. 907: Nunquam hoc uno die *efficiatur* opus.

Now that the existence of this subjunctive has become so widely recognized, it will no longer seem an unnatural interpretation to

[1] Buck, The Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System, Studies in Class. Phil., Chicago, 1895, p. 146; also Buck, Osc.-Umbr. Grammar, 1904, p. 219, of which he has kindly permitted me to use the proof sheets.

[2] Historische Lateinische Grammatik (1903), p. 123. Cf. also p. 124, where Blase with Rodenbusch and Hale takes *quaecumque optes*, cited above, as an example of the Anticipatory subjunctive, rather than as due to attraction. His words are: "Ähnlich nahe stehen sich Konj. Präs. und futur im Relativsatz . . . So ist der unklassische Konjunktif in verallgemeinernden Relativsätzen zu erklären wie As. 44, di tibi dent quaecumque optes; Stich., 69 pati nos oportet, quod ille *faciat* quoius potestas plus potest. Denn da, wo futurale Bedeutung ausgeschlossen ist, steht der Indikativ, wie Pers. 293 eveniant tibi quae optas (= modo optavisti). . . . Eine Reihe von Typen des konjunktivischen Gebrauchs in untergeordneten Sätzen führt auf diesen von ihm 'prospektiv' genannten Gebrauch zurück Hale, The Anticipatory Subjunctive, etc." Blase is, however, not correct in stating that "wo futurale bedeutung ausgeschlossen ist, steht der indikativ." The futures of this kind are, to be sure, *usually* in the subjunctive; but it has escaped Blase's notice that these very cases had by the time of Plautus gone so far in creating a habit for attraction that even present generalizing clauses of the same general nature are frequently in the subjunctive, and that this habit had been strengthened by a factor already referred to (p. 5), in which, even in the present tense, the subordinate clause is subjunctive by the extension of the modal feeling from the governing verb. The dependent clause of Pseud. 936, tantum tibi boni di immortales duint quantum tu tibi *exoptes*, certainly refers to the present time, for the wish in question had just been expressed. Nevertheless it is in the subjunctive mood. The context is equally explicit in referring the dependent verb of M. G. 1038, di tibi dent quaequomque optes, to the present. For further examples, see the list on p. 32. Furthermore Blase, by his interpretation, which is correct enough, of the illustration which he cites (eveniant tibi quae optas [= modo optavisti]), shows that he is really not dealing with a generalizing ("verallgemeinerenden") clause, but with a determinative clause; and he has failed to see that *quae optas* is in

take *optes* of the sentence cited by Mr. Hale (di tibi dent quaecumque optes) as a survival of the Anticipatory subjunctive, and to state that these anticipatory subjunctives, surviving, as is natural, after present subjunctives *referring to the* future, formed an important influence in the development of the *habit* of attraction.[1] An examination of the table following will show that a very large percentage of the verbs referring to the future and depending upon a verb in the subjunctive is placed in the same mood; that in fact the percentage is far higher here than in any other time-sphere; and that if, in addition to referring to the future, the subordinate verb is placed *in close proximity* to the governing subjunctive (cf. p. 46), it is almost invariably in the same mood.

the indicative, not because it does not refer to the future, but because it is a very definite determinative clause (=quae modo optavisti) (cf. p. 49). Blase was probably led astray by the erroneous statement of Lange (loc. cit., p. 45): Hic usus apud Plautum et Terentium certis etiamdum finibus constrictus fuit: tum enim solum adhibitus est cum in enuntiatione demonstrativa futura aliqua notio continetur. But Lange had himself seen that the subordinate verb, even when referring to the future, was less frequently in the subjunctive when it preceded the main subjunctive than when it was closely attached to it (p. 39). A sharper analysis then, even if Blase failed in data, would have led him to the conclusion that the mood in these cases was not wholly a matter of the expression of the idea of futurity, but in some of them was due to the proximity of the clause to the subjunctive of the governing clause, i. e., to *mechanical* attraction.

[1] In this connection it should be noted that the examples of attraction—so-called—which occur in Oscan and Umbrian are verbs which refer to the future. The list is as follows:

1. pun far kahad, nip putiiad edum. (Curse of Vibia.) (When he takes food may he not be able to eat.) (Buck, Osc.-Umbr. Verb-System, p. 147.)

2. prehabia, pĭre uraku ri esuna si herte, et pure esune sis. Iguv. Tab. V, a, 5. (praehibeat quidquid ad illam rem diuinam sit oporteat, et qui in diuino sint. Buck, Osc.-Umbr. Verb-System, p. 144.)

3. persei marsei (?) depending upon a subjunctive. Iguv. Tab. VI, a, 28, 38, 48. ("So far as is right.") This is not an undoubted instance. See Buck, Osc.-Umbr. Grammar, p. 218.

Mr. Buck, from whose paper (The Oscan-Umbrian Verb System) I have taken these examples, adds in a footnote (p. 149) "Assimilation may be a conserving rather than a creative force, may merely tend to preserve an old construction against the inroads of the future indicative."

Subjunctives Which Refer to the Future and Depend Upon Subjunctives.

A. *Depending upon Independent Volitive Subjunctives.*

In the Second Person.

qui. Hec. 391, id facias *quod* in rem *sit* tuam.

Stich. 149, neque tu me celassis *quod scias.*

cum. Cato,[1] R. R. 61, agrum frumentarium *cum ares* bene . . . ares.

In the Third Person.

cum. Asin. 776–7, neque illaec ulli pede pedem homini premat *quom surgat,*

. . . neque *quom descendat* inde, det quoiquam manum.

Asin. 780, *quom iaciat* "te" ne dicat.

Cf. Oscan,[2] *Pun* far *kahad,* nip putiiad edum (when he takes food, may he not be able to eat).

ubi. Truc. 233, *ubi* nil *habeat* alium quaestum coepiat.

Cato, R. R. 3, olea *ubi* lecta *siet,* oleum fiat continuo.

dum. Poen. 20, neu sessum ducat *dum* histrio in scaena *siet.*

Truc. 232, *dum habeat,* dum amet.

quando. Pseud. 307, *quando* nil *sit,* simul amare desinat.

ubicumque. Bacch. 652, *ubiquomque usus siet,* pectore expromat suo.

qui. Plaut. Frag. Fab. cert. 91, *quique liceat,* ueneat.

Cato, R. R. 2, *quae* satis accipienda *sint,* satis accipiantur.

" " 2, frumentum *quod supersit* uendat.

" " 5, cui *iussus siet,* auscultet.

" " 2, *quae opus sint* locato, locentur.

" " 89, ex gula consideret, *quod* satis *sit.*

Aul. 156, *quae* cras *ueniat,* perendie foras feratur.

[1] As Cato's treatise is a series of directions for a definite person, with a view to future contingencies, we need not doubt that the subjunctives quoted from the *De Re Rustica* refer to the future, and further that they are never instances of the subjunctive in the second person indefinite.

[2] From the "Curse of Vibia," see Buck, Oscan-Umbrian Verb System, p. 147.

B. *Depending upon Dependent Clauses of Plan.*

cum.

Aul. 278, ibo intro ut . . . facta *quom ueniat* sient.

Asin. 185, ut *quom uideat* gaudeat.

Cas. 133, unde auscultare possis *quom* ego illam *ausculer.*

Cur. 253, ut sit paratum prandium *quom ueniat.*

Most. 1064, astate, ut *quom* extemplo *uocem,* continuo exiliatis.

Most. 249, ornata ut sim *quom* huc *adueniat.*

Pseud. 168, ne mora quae sit . . . cocus *quom ueniat.*

Pseud. 1115, ne *quom adsiet* metuam.

Pers. 190, ut domi sis *quom* ego te esse illi *censeam.*

Pers. 191, uti domi sim *quom* illi *censeas.*

Pers. 152, ut fleat *quom* ea *memoret.*

Cato, R. R. 73, ne quaeras *quom* opus *siet.*

Heaut. 711, ut *quom narret* senex . . . non credat tamen.

Adel. 354, curre . . . ut *quom opus sit,* ne in mora nobis siet.

Andr. 424, i nunciam intro ne in mora *quom opus sit* sies.

Phorm. 839, ne *quom* hic non *uideant,* me conficere credant argentum.

Hec. 694,[1] ut cum illa uiuas testem hanc *quom* abs te *amoueris.*

Eun. 933,[1] ut *quom cognorit* perpetuo oderit.

Men. 543,[1] ut te lubenter uideam *quom* ad nos *ueneris.*

Cap. 435,[1] tu me ignores *quom* extemplo meo e conspectu *abscesseris.*

Heaut. 854, ut *quom desponderim* des.

quando.

Bacch. 768, ut *quando exeat,* extemplo . . . ei tabellas dem.

Men. 1045, ne tum *quando* sanus *factus sit,* a me argentum petat.

Bacch. 730, ut pater cognoscat litteras, *quando legat.*

Poen. 552, ut *quando agas,* quid agas, sciant.

[1] The dependent verbs are probably in the subjunctive, cf. p. 51.

priusquam. Eun. 751, caue ne *priusquam*[1] hanc *accipias,* amittas.

ubi. Bacch. 43, ut *ubi* emeritum sibi *sit* se reuehat domum.

" 45, ut reuehatur domum *ubi* ei *dederit* operas.

M. G. 3, ut *ubi* usus *ueniat* . . . praestringat oculorum aciem.

Pers. 230, ne *ubi* uorsicapillus *fias,* foede semper seruias.

Truc. 230, quin *ubi* nil *det* . . . eum mittat . . . domum.

M. G. 1122, ut *ubi* illaec *prodeat* me prouoces.

M. G. 946, nequid, *ubi* miles *uenerit,* titubetur.

dum. Cur. 664, ut semper *dum uiuat* me alat.

qui. Aul. 600, herile imperium ediscat ut *quod* frons *uelit* oculi sciant; *quod iubeat* . . . properet persequi.

Pseud. 883, ut *quisque* . . . *gustauerit* . . . faciam.

Pers. 156, adferto causiam quam ille habeat *qui* hanc . . . *uendat.*

Merc. 504, ut *quod imperetur* facias.

Cato, R. R. 137, quod bubus satis siet, *qui* illic *sient.*

comparison. Truc. 96, nequis aduentor grauior abaetat *quam aduenìat.*

ubicumque. Pseud. 580, ut *ubiquomque* hostibus *congrediar* . . . ut uincam.

C. *Depending upon Clauses of Proviso.*

qui. M. G. 785–6,[2] dum modo eam des *quae sit* quaestuosa, *quae alat* corpus corpore, *quoique sapiat* pectus.

D. *Depending upon Substantive Clauses of Fear.*

cum. Heaut. 1017, metuis ne non *quom uelis* conuincas esse illum tuom.

qui. Bacch. 1173, non metuo nequid mihi doleat *quod ferias.*

[1] See p. 53.

[2] Perhaps this illustrates the volitive subjunctive.

E. *Depending upon Substantive Clauses of Plan, Wish, or Request.*

cum. Amph. 542, numquid uis? Ut *quom absim* me ames.

Amph. 983, fac sis . . . ut ministres mihi, mihi *quom sacruficem.*

Aul. 273, curata fac sint *quom* a foro *redeam* domum.

Capt. 494, irrogabo multam ut mihi cenas decem meo arbitratu dent *quom cara* annona *sit.*

Stich. 65, facite sultis nitidae ut aedes meae sint *quom redeam.*

M. G. 578, ut miles *quom extemplo* a foro *adueniat* domum, comprehendar.

Cato, R. R. 28, caueto *cum* uentus *siet* aut imber, effodias.

quando. Truc. 433, (uolo) ut *quando* otium tibi *sit* ad me reuisas.

Pseud. 663, uide sis ne in quaestione sis *quando*[1] *accersam.*

ubi. Aul. 613, quin *ubi accersat* meam extemplo filiam ducat domum.

Rud. 1220, (fac) ut mi Ampelisca nubat *ubi* ego *sim* liber.

Poen. 855, ut *ubi* mihi uapulandum *sit* tu corium sufferas.

Eun. 394, hoc prouiso ut *ubi* tempus *siet* deducam.

Cato, R. R. 2, *ubi* ea cognita aequo animo *sint* . . . uti perficiantur.

dum. Pers. 495, faciam ut mei memineris *dum* uitam *uiuas.*

Rud. 499, deos immortales quaeso *dum uiuas* uti omnes tui similes hospites habeas tibi.

Adel. 681, uelim me . . . ames *dum uiuas.*

utquomque. Andr. 736, tu ut subseruias orationi *utquomque* opus *sit* uerbis uide.

quam primum. Capt. 448, ut *quam primum possis* redeas.

Trin. 41, teque ut *quam primum possim* uideam emortuam.

[1] I do not hesitate to class *accersam* with the subjunctives.

qui. Stich. 121, pridie caueat ne faciat *quod pigeat* postridie.

Capt. 386, ut potissimum *quod* in rem recte *conducat* tuam id petam.

Most. 558, eum uideto ut capias *qui credat* mihi.

Pers. 616, scio officium meum, ut *quae rogiter* uera eloquar.

Phorm. 449, *quae* in rem tuam *sint* ea uelim facias.

Eun. 1026, ut faciam *quod iubeat.*

Hec. 65, quin . . . laceres *quemque nacta sis.*

Heaut. 721, quasi non ea potestas sit tua *quo uelis* in tempore ut te exsoluas.

Men. 549, ut *quantum possint quique liceant* ueneant.

Cato, R. R. 2, reliqua *quae sint* ut compareant.

Cato, R. R. 2, *quae supersint* uti ueneant.

F. *Depending upon Independent Expressions of Wish.*

qui. Asin. 44, di tibi dent *quaequomque optes.*

Trin. 713, bene *quod agas* eueniat tibi.

Phorm. 552, di bene uortant *quod agas.* So also Hec. 197.)

Epid. 6,[1] di dent *quae uelis.* (So also Pers. 483; Poen. 1055; Stich. 469; Trin. 1152.)

Trin. 437, di duint tibi *quaequomque optes.*

Afranius 358, di tibi dent propria *quaequomque exoptes.*

G. *Depending upon Another Anticipatory Subjunctive.*

cum. Heaut. 544, (expectat) dum hic denuo abeat *quom* tolerare illius sumptus non *queat.*

qui. Poen. 747, quam . . . *quod loquantur* creduam.

[1] This expression and its equivalents are often used in salutations and seem to refer to the future. Interesting varieties of it are found in Asin. 623, dabunt di *quae uelitis,* and in Pers. 16, dabunt *di quae exoptes,* which betray the tense-tone of the expression. Here *uelitis* and *exoptes* are evidently in the anticipatory subjunctive, and depend in both instances upon *dabunt,* which is virtually a future imperative.

H. *Depending upon Potential Subjunctives.*

dum. Phorm. 1030, habet haec ei quod *dum uiuat* usque ad aurem obganniat.

qui. Cas. 256, ubi educat pueros *quos pariat.*

cum. Afranius 199,

Non usque quaque idoneum inuenias locum
Ubi derepente *cum uelis* facias lutum.

ubi. Eun. 1080, facile pellas *ubi uelis.*

I. *Depending upon Conditional Subjunctives.*

cum. Men. 454, qui nisi adsint *quom citentur* census capiat ilico.

Poen. 27, ne uarientur uirgis . . . si minus curassint *quom* eri *reueniant* domum.

Truc. 234, nisi modo *quom dederit* dare iam lubeat denuo.

quando. Merc. 406, flagitium sit si sequatur *quando incedat* per uias.

ubi. Poen. 148, *ubi dissolutus* tu *sies,* ego pendeam.

J. *Depending upon Clauses of Result.*

cum. Andr. 394, patri dic uelle, ut *quom uelit* tibi iure irasci non queat.

Phorm. 822, quas *quom* res *aduorsae sint,* paulo mederi possis.

Accius 337, nunquam erit tam immanis *cum* non mea opera extinctum *sciat* quin fragescat.

dum. Heaut. 951, adeo exornatum dabo . . . ut *dum uiuat* meminerit.

K. *Depending upon Indirect Questions of Futurity.*

qui. Eun. 790, qui scis an *quae iubeam* sine ui faciat?

L. *Depending upon an Indirect Question of Doubt.*

cum. Merc. 344, neque is *quom roget* quid loquar cogitatumst.

INDICATIVES (FUTURE OR PRESENT–FUTURE) DEPENDING UPON SUBJUNCTIVES. (*Not attracted.*)

qui. M. G. 573, post hac etiam illud quod scies, nesciueris. Asin. 781, deam inuocet sibi quam lubebit. Pers. 524, suo periculo is emat qui eam mercabitur. Rud. 486, qui homo sese miserum uolet Neptuno credat sese. Cato, R. R. 8, qui eum . . . habebit, paret. Cato, R. R. 22, uti expleas quod interest. Cato, R. R. 31, quae opus erunt parentur. Cato, R. R. 70, ieiunus siet qui dabit. Cato, R. R. 89, gallinas teneras quae primum parient concludat. Cato, R. R. 32, rami ut diuaricentur quos relinques. Cato, R. R. 103, qui fastidient cibum ut . . . adpetant . . . spargito. Cato, R. R. 142, ut quae opus sunt, parentur. Most. 1095, ne huc confugere possint quaestioni quos dabit. Amph. 608, caue quicquam nisi quod rogabo te mihi responderis. Bacch. 989, uolo ut quod iubebo facias. M. G. 254, inducamus uera ut esse credat quae mentabimur. Cur. 432, quaeso qui has tabellas adferet ut ei detur. M. G. 81, qui auscultare nolet, exsurgat foras.

cum. Cato, R. R. 23, quom pluet, quala parentur. Cato, R. R. 25, quom uinum coctum erit facito ut seruetur. Cato, R. R. 40, quom praecides caueto ne librum conuellas. Cato, R. R. 45, ne liber laboret cum dolabis. Cato, R. R. 45, ne librum scindas cum adiges. Cato, R. R. 54, ne sectentur cum arabunt. Pseud. 163, haec quom reuortor facite ut offendam parata. M. G. 1176, quom extemplo hoc erit factum, facito ut uenias. Mer. 146, ne laborem capias quom illo uti uoles. Rud. 1206, adorna ut rem diuinam faciam, quom aduenero. Asin. 372, mox quom Saurean imitabor, caueto ne suscenseas. Amph. 197, meditabor quo modo dicam quom aduenero. Bacch. 826, ut auferam quom illum rescisces. Hec. 575, uereor ne orata nostra nequeat celare quom sciet. Hec. 769,

quom tu eris satura ut puer satur sit facito. M. G. 811, ut cum hic agit, actutum partis defendas tuas.

ubi. Cato, R. R. 86, ubi coctum erit lacte addat. Cato, R. R. 156, ubi libido ueniet . . . decumbat. Cato, R. R. 156, ubi uersus ibit heminam . . . bibat. Cato, R. R. 95, ubi erit crassum . . . sinito frigescat. Pers. 86, curate . . . ne mihi morae sit ubi intro aduenero. Bacch. 36, ubi me fugiet memoria . . . facito ut subuenias. Capt. 342, ubi erunt indutiae illuc, qui conueniat patrem. Epid. 595, ubi noles, ne fueris pater. Pers. 384, uideto, me ubi uoles nuptum dare, ne faciat.

quando. Most. 403, neu quisquam responset quando aedis pultabit. Bacch. 224, ueniat quando uolt. Hec. 619, utrum illaec fecerint quando haec aberit. Aul. 78, ut faciam litteram longam, meum laqueo collum quando obstrinxero. Poen. 1409, quando ex neruo emissu's, compingare in carcerem.

quotiens. Cato, R. R. 151, quotiens opus erit, purges. Cato, R. R. 151, quotienscumque opus erit facito ut addas.

quo. Cato, R. R. 21, ne foramina maiora fiant quo indentur. Men. 1044, dicam ut abeat liber quo uolet.

quam. Cato, R. R. 66, quam diligentissime poterit, tollat.

dum (= while). Rud. 779, ego dum abes ut abeat non sinam. Rud. 558, tibi copiast dum lingua uiuet qui rem soluas. Poen. 1421, dum auctionem facio opust ut maneas.

dum (= until). Rud. 880, suadeo ut ad nos abeant potius, dum recipis. Truc. 874, ut . . . sinas . . . dum aliquo miles circumducitur. Phorm. 513, ut me maneat . . . triduom hoc dum id . . . aufero. Eun. 894, uin interea dum uenit domi opperiamur? Rud. 773, oro ut illas serues . . . dum ego erum adduco meum. M. G. 1333, ne interueneris quaeso, dum resipiscit. Adel. 786, nisi . . . dum haec silescunt, abeam.

priusquam antequam. Epid. 304, ne abitas priusquam ego ad te uenero. Bacch. 381, priusquam malum istoc addis certumst dicam. Cato, R. R. 161, ne ante sarueris quam asparagus natus erit. Asin. 448, nunc adeam optimust priusquam incipit tinnire. Phorm. 719, ut conueniat hanc priusquam hinc abit. Phorm. 898, priusquam dilapidat . . ut auferamus. M. G. 1408, obsecro . . . te . . . ut audias priusquam secat. Andr. 558, priusquam . . . redducunt animum, uxorem demus. Poen. 1399, ut minam . . . reddas priusquam . . . abducere. Bacch. 440, at . . . priusquam septuennis est, si attingas eum.

donec. Cato, R. R. 86, lacte addat donec crassus erit factus. Bacch. 758, ne quoquam exsurgatis donec a me erit signum datum.

Before we draw conclusions from these tables, a word of warning must be given. It will be noticed that the usage of Cato diverges noticeably from that of the other early writers, a fact which is easily understood by the reader of the De Re Rustica. When Cato has once fairly entered his subject, his work becomes practically a string of sentences shaped after this mould: quom (ubi, si, etc.) . . . *erit, facito,* with remarkable monotony. There are over three hundred sentences of this form in the little volume. Naturally, then, the future indicative becomes so fixed in the dependent clause, that one could hardly expect it to be attracted to the subjunctive when, for any reason, a jussive subjunctive is used instead of an imperative in the main clause. That I am right in saying that the future indicative becomes *fixed,* is proved by the fact that in the first few chapters, several cases of attraction occur before the use of the regularly recurring future indicative with the imperative becomes noticeable; after that they are remarkably rare. I would also add that conclusions drawn from my lists in regard to priusquam-, dum-, and si-clauses, would be erroneous if accepted without modification (see pp. 52–5). After dum = until, it is customary to classify the verbs as inherently subjunctive; but the very fact that about sixty per cent. of the verbs after dum = until are in the indicative[1] in early Latin,

[1] Hale-Buck, Grammar, 571, and footnote, for the explanation of this fact.

and that over half of those which are in the subjunctive are also in dependence upon subjunctives and infinitives, goes to show that many of the latter must be due to *attraction*. In general the same condition of things obtains with the priusquam-clauses. With si-clauses, the feeling of the less vivid future is so subtile in early Latin that, in the majority of cases where the present subjunctive is found with si in dependence upon another subjunctive, I believe it is impossible to say with certainty whether the writer would have used an indicative, if the clause had not been thus dependent (see p. 54). In cases of this class, accordingly, it must be understood that the list of subjunctives is not as complete as that of the indicatives.

A fair comparison of the two uses may be made in the temporal clauses with cum, ubi, and quando, as well as in the qui-clauses of Plautus and Terence. The following table will show a marked preponderance of the subjunctive in clauses which refer to the future and depend upon another subjunctive.

	cum.	*ubi.*	*quando.*	*qui.*	*Total.*
Subjunctive	40	15	8	35	98
Indicative	10	5	5	10	30

This proportion of the subjunctive to the indicative becomes significant when one finds that, in early Latin, attraction is rather the exception than the rule, and that about *thirty-five per cent.* of the clauses which, so far as function and position are concerned, are capable of being attracted, are in fact so affected. The tense, therefore, is significant; and the examination has confirmed the theory that the anticipatory subjunctive was still a force in Latin during the time of Plautus. If then it is found to " supply a large factor to the development of attraction," it will readily be seen from the list just given that the factor is exceedingly important, for this class alone makes up about 55 per cent. of all the early Latin verbs that are usually classed as subjunctives by attraction in the grammars.

E.

The note quoted above (p. 4) from Professor Hale's paper on the Anticipatory Subjunctive gives a good illustration, from conditional sentences, of the kind of verb now under discussion: C. I. L., I, 196: Sei quis esent *quei* sibei *deicerent* necesus ese

Bacanal habere. Cf. Trin. 472, siquid tibi placeat *quod* illi congestum *siet,* edisne? in which the conditional feeling is nearly as strong in the quod-clause as in the *si*-clause. In the following there is more or less of the conditional feeling. It will be noticed that the dependent clause in the second example is, strictly speaking, in grammatical dependence upon the apodosis of the sentence, that is, upon a subjunctive of Ideal Certainty. Quod uideas is equivalent to si quid uideas.

Amph. 871, Nam mea sit culpa *quod* egomet *contraxerim*
Si id Alcumenae innocenti expetat.

Men. 111, Ni mala, ni stulta sis . . .
Quod uiro esse odio *uideas* tute tibi odio habeas.

There are numerous examples like the following:

Capt. 205, At pigeat postea nostrum erum si uos eximat uinculis aut solutos sinat *quos* argento *emerit,*

in which there is a break in time-sphere, and the dependent clause, if emphasis were given to its actual time-feeling, would not be in the subjunctive; but the speaker for the moment conceives of the act from the ideal rather than the actual point of view, and expresses this feeling by using the same mood as in the si-clause. Cf. Bacch. 778, Ni facta cupiam quae is *uelit* (strictly, "what he now wishes"; ideally, "whatever he may wish") tua iam uirgis latera lacerentur probe. See also Curc., 269; Bacch., 564; Hec., 555.

F.

In the same way a clause depending upon a subjunctive of Ideal Certainty may, strictly speaking, state a general truth or an objective fact, and at the same time express that fact *ideally,* that is, with the same mental attitude with which the rest of the clause is uttered. The dependent verb is thus thrown into the same mood and tense with the verb on which it depends. A case in point in the present tense may be seen in Cis. 497, quodcumque *optes* tibi uelim contingere, "if you should desire a thing, I should like you to have it." Contrast Curc. 82, Nam istunc *qui fert* afflictum uelim. The following is an example of a clause depending upon a verb contrary to fact: Bacch. 488, si opperiri uellem . . . , plus uiderem *quam deceret,* "more than would be fitting," instead

of "more than is fitting." Contrast Adel. 108, si homo esses, sineres nunc facere dum per aetatem *licet*. *Deceret* has to my mind the same tone as *uiderem*. The same relation holds true in the dependent clause of the following in Rud. 1261, *dum* praedam habere se *censeret*, interim praeda ipsus esset.

In the following, on the other hand, we seem to have a clear case of attraction: Poen. 681, uidere equidem uos uellem quom huic aurum *darem*, "I should like to have you see when I give him the money." The fact seems to be that, after conditional subjunctives and subjunctives of ideal certainty, Latin freely conceives of the subordinate act from the ideal point of view, unless the fact of its *objective reality* is to be emphasized, as in Aul. 482, inuidia nos minore utamur *quam utimur*, or unless its time-sphere is clearly different from that of the governing clause, as in Asin. 860, nunquam faceret ea quae *nunc facit*. Complete lists of examples may be found on pp. 40–1.

G.

The indirect question was evidently passing through an important change in the time of Plautus. We need not here discuss the process of the change; suffice it to say that the subjunctive was coming to be the mood for these expressions, and that a feeling was arising which demanded the subjunctive for all indirectly quoted questions; and when the quotation included a dependent clause, this too naturally came to be put into the same mood if it was felt to be an integral part of the original question. Thus, in the following sentence, Merc. 623, quin percontatu's, hominis quae facies foret qui illam emisset? the quoted question includes a relative clause, and the whole question "hominis quae facies erat qui illam amiserat" is thrown into the subjunctive. For the sake of comparison, I quote the following, in which the relative clause is not conceived of as a part of the quotation: Trin. 7, quae illaec siet huc quae abiit intro dicam.

I would suggest that the origins of attraction in clauses of this sort go even deeper, and that the so-called relative clause in many instances was still, as in its origin, actually felt as an interrogative in dependence upon the main verb of the sentence.[1] I mean

[1]Cf. Sommer, Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formlehre, 293: Hervorgegangen ist die relativ Funktion hauptsächlich aus den indirekten

that in a sentence like the following: Aul. 29, Is scit *quae sit quam compresserit,* the speaker may have felt practically the two questions, *quis est? quam compressit?* Compare Poen. 1027, Narra, quid est, quid ait! ibid. 711, Quid est? quid uoltis, testes? It must be noted that in the example quoted, the interrogative feminine becomes quae in the indirect quotation, though in the direct question it would be quis as a substantive in Plautus. This fact would facilitate confusion between the relative and interrogative in the case of the feminine pronouns. In the case of the masculine, since qui and quis[1] both occurred frequently as interrogatives, there must have been frequent confusion. Of course, in the majority of indirect questions, the possibility of interpreting the dependent relative clause as an interrogative is precluded by the unmistakable nature of the clause. It is entirely out of the question in sentences like the following, as a glance will suffice to show: Pseud. 451, quanto satius est . . . exquaerere sint illa necne sint *quae* tibi *renuntiant;* Aul. 17, Coepi obseruari ecqui maiorem filius mihi honorem haberet *quam* eius *habuisset* pater. Sentences like the following, however, would allow the possibility: Amph. 1016, pergam exquirere quis fuerit *quem* propter corpus suom stupri *compleuerit;* M. G. 261, hominem inuestigando operam huic . . . dabo qui fuerit conseruous *qui* hodie *sit* sectatus simiam.

Fragesätzen, die ja oft der Bedeutung von Relativsätzen sehr nahe kommen. Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, III, p. 403, illustrates well the ambiguity of some relatives. He says: Das Relativum entsteht in abhängigen Fragen. Es giebt viele abhängige Fragesätze, in welchen man das Pronomen ebenso gut interrogativisch wie relativisch auffassen kann z. B. concrepuit ostium, videamus, qui hinc egreditur Men. 348, 'sehen wir nach, wer kommt hier heraus?' oder 'sehen wir nach dem, der hierauskommt.' The literature on the question of the relation of the relative pronoun to the interrogative and indefinite pronouns can be found by means of the list of references in Delbrück, ibid., p. 400.

[1] Cf. Truc. 708. Nunc speculabor quid ibi agatur, *quis* eat intro, *qui* foras ueniat. Cf. also Sommer, Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formlehre, 293: Für die Flexion machte ursprünglich der Bedeutungsunterschied nichts aus, das Paradigma war für alle drei Verwendungen dasselbe. In R. R. 145, homines eos dato, qui placebunt aut custodi aut *quis* eam oleam emerit, Cato uses quis as a relative. What has been said in this paragraph must, however, apply to written rather than spoken sentences, for I am aware of the fact that the stress of an interrogative pronoun is often not that of a relative. Cf. Seyffert, Berl. Phil. Woch., 1891, p. 108.

We have also noticed (p. 21) that the anticipatory indirect questions must be reckoned with in this account, if we are right in supposing that their force will help to account for the mood of verbs like *adimat* in the following: Phorm. 161, expecto quam mox ueniat *qui adimat* hanc mihi consuetudinem.

Summary.

We have now examined the more objective forces which were at work in developing the construction in question, and with our eye upon the facts so far found, are ready to make a partial statement in regard to what attraction is and what it is not. It has become clear, I think, that attraction is more than a "Streben nach Concinnität des Ausdrucks" (Draeger, I, p. 316) in each individual instance,—it is not even a habit which springs purely and simply from such a *streben* ("hervorgegangen," ibid.). The phrase "Streben nach Concinnität" implies a feeling for style which comes with a highly developed prose, and I fear definitions like the one just quoted come from an examination of attraction as used by Cicero in his best prose,—where it actually merges into such an "effort at concinnity,"—and not from an historical study of the construction. This is rather a habit which took shape under the influence of the several similar constructions that we have discussed in the preceding, and it worked outward from those definite starting-points along the lines governed by the laws of analogy. True it is that in the examples of the original type, the subjunctive of the dependent clause was due to the fact that this clause happened to contain the same modal feeling as the governing clause. But in the growing construction of attraction proper, identity of mental attitude is not a sine qua non of its occurrence. Attraction then appears to be in the main a phenomenon of natural linguistic evolution which falls under the category of analogy working mechanically, rather than of a conscious (or unconscious) mental attitude[1] connected with stylistic considerations. As we have seen, its origins are found in the language, not of artistic

[1] I have been careful to say that this is only a "partial statement," for I fully understand the danger of neglecting the element of *ψυχικὴ διάθεσις* in the discussion of a construction as subjective as this. There are psychological considerations that must be taken into account before the final definition is given. I shall have something to say on this point in a later paper.

prose, but of such prose as we find in Early Latin. They necessarily belong, of course, to the post-paratactic period, but to that part of the period while style was still quite simple and unadorned. The very fact that these origins are to be placed in a fairly well-developed stage of the language, and yet before the feeling for the intricate and finely wrought periods of Cicero's day arises, is a matter of great significance, and again points to the same conclusion, that the construction is not to be traced to considerations of style.

What the real genetic forces were we have pointed out in the preceding pages, and have illustrated them by sentences in which the dependent clause directly expressed the same feeling as the independent clause, or a feeling kindred to it. These sentences we have found in connection with the following subjunctives: Jussive, Permissive, Deliberative (and its extensions), Dependent Volitive, Optative, Subjunctive of Obligation or Propriety, Anticipatory (present-future and past-future), Conditional Subjunctive, Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty, and Subjunctive in Indirect Questions. In other words, the origins of this construction are found to exist in connection with almost every kind of subjunctive of any importance in Early Latin, and the actual instances of the original kind are there found to be more than half of the verbs usually considered as cases of attraction.

CHAPTER II.

The Uses of the Construction, Tables.

Having discussed the genesis of the construction, we must now see how it behaved, how far it extended, and what forces opposed its workings.

I shall first give a list of subjunctives attracted by volitives in the primary clause, placing in a parallel column unattracted verbs of the same general nature, for convenience of comparison. I shall group these with reference to the relative closeness of time between the dependent and independent verbs, for we have already seen that a shift of time-sphere is a most important consideration in the matter of attraction. The remaining groups will then be treated in the same way in their proper order.

It is also necessary to note that identity of grammatical tense does not by any means imply identity of actual time. A universal present may, for instance, depend upon a present volitive subjunctive; both may be in the present subjunctive, while, in respect to actual time, the volitive is future, and its subordinate verb is present. Of course, for the moment the speaker may be in the future attitude of mind with regard to both verbs, but he is not necessarily so. This general consideration must be applied to verbs in the other tenses as well.

The following tables do not contain the verbs which refer to the future, as a full list of these has been given. On the other hand, I have included the examples of the "subjunctive of like feeling" even when they have already been listed in the preceding, for it is of course quite impossible to state in any given case that the force of mechanical attraction was not at work. For past-futures see p. 12. Except in the case of indirect questions, where I found it necessary to give complete statistics, I have excluded the verbs which were clearly in indirect discourse—explicit or "implied." Such verbs usually depend upon clauses introduced by *impero, postulo,* etc., or by causal *quod.*

Group I.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of will or wish.

1. Both the governing and the dependent verbs are in the present tense.

	Dependent verb not attracted (Indicative).	*Dependent verb attracted (Subjunctive).*
	(a) The governing verb is independent.	
qui.	Rud. 1229, habeas *quod* di *dant.* Asin. 644, facias *quod suades.* Bacch. 990c, *iubeo;* Asin. 180, *lubet;* Cist. 768, *est;* Bacch. 993, *iubeo;* Most. 594, *est;* Trin. 351, *habes;* Trin. 979, *lubet;* Andr. 393, *facis;* Heaut. 177, *excruciat;* Eun. 78, *habet;* Hec. 810, *refert;* Adel. 622, *placet;* Men. 349, *egreditur;* Capt. 609, *uolt;* Aul. 542, *habent;* Men. 353, *est;* M. G. 1054, *oro;* Andr. 697, *uolunt;* Heaut. 464, *lubet;* Eun. 529, *uolt;* Truc. 233, *habent;* Cato, R. R. 4, *mutant;* Aul. 776, *uolt;* Curc. 180, *est;* Merc. 991, *uolt;* Most. 222, *uolunt;* Most. 306, *gaudent;* Pers. 373, *uolt;* Afranius, 407, *lubet;* Cato, Frag. p. 79, *opus est, necesse est.* Phorm. 519 *es;* Phorm. 165, *amo;* Heaut. 589, *extrudis;* Hec. 579, *exopto;* Hec. 469, *nuntiant;* Men. 308, *habitant;* Asin. 841, *uolunt;* Eun. 665, *uolunt;* Andr. 931, *spero;* Pseud. 108, *dicis;* Rud. 158, *quaero;* Rud. 992, *habet*; Stich. 320, *refert.*	Capt. 548, ne tu *quod* istic *fabuletur* auris immittas tuas. Most. 1100, *quod agas* id agas. Pseud. 570, det locum illi *qui queat.* Bacch. 656, furetur *quod queat.* Lucil. 572, concedat homini id *quod uelit.* M. G. 1038, di tibi dent *quaequomque optes.*
ubi.	Truc. 163, *ubi mortuost* quiescat.	
quando.	Trin. 671, *copiast.*	

quom. Most. 871, *quom impluit* ne impluat mi. Bacch. 536, *aduenis;* Capt. 355, *honestas;* M. G. 1419, *ades;* Poen. 668, *datis;* Poen. 687, *uis;* Adel. 918, *uideo;* Trin. 671, *est.*

quoniam. Truc. 127, *aduenis.*

dum. Merc. 553, *dum potes* ames; Truc. 163, *uiuit.*

ut. Asin. 731, nunc *ut est* eloquamur; Adel. 399, est; Turpilius 191, *meres.*

Amph. 960, *eri ut sint,* ipse item sit.

Bacch. 661, *utcumque* res *sit* ita animum habeat.

quam. Stich. 44, nos faciant *quam aequomst.*

Hec. 634, turbent *quam uelint.*

quantum. Aul. 785, di *quantumst* perduint; Heaut. 870, *est;* Pseud. 37, *est.*

Pseud. 936, tantum tibi boni di duint *quantum* tu tibi *exoptes.*

quo. Cato, R. R. 1, *ambulant.*

Aul. 491, *quo lubeant* nubant.

(*b*) *The governing verb is dependent.*

qui. Aul. 576, *quod habeo* ut commutet; Aul. 546, sospitent *quod* nunc *habes;* Amph. 870, *accusat;* Amph. 970, *opust;* Capt. 329, *sentio;* Capt. 908, *pendent;* Cas. 311, *postulas;* Cas. 512, *paratumst;* Cist. 632, *oportet;* Cist. 13, *arbitrar;* Curc. 159, *agimus;* Epid. 268, *uolt;* Epid. 456, *aduenio;* Men. 427, *uolo;* Men. 558, *dant;* Men. 955, *opus est;* Mer. 937, *expetis;* M. G. 728–9, *probast, improbast;* M. G. 945, *agendumst;* Most. 903, *mulcet;* Pseud. 12, *nescio;* Pseud. 168, *ibist;* Stich. 26, *metuis;* Truc. 722, *uolo;* Andr. 339, *est;* Trin. 654, *habes;* Heaut. 867, *cupis;* Hec. 325, *est;* Adel. 706, *sunt;* Lucil. 36, *impendet;* Lucil. 440,

Cas. 252, domuisti animum ut *quod* uir *uelit* fieri id facias?

Epid. 283, iam amota ei fuerit omnis consultatio nuptiarum ne grauetur *quod uelis.*

Pers. 601, ut tibi percontari liceat *quae uelis.*

Trin. 221, pauci sint faxim *qui sciant.*

Amph. 630, ut *quae imperes* compareant.

Men. 994, Caue quisquam *quod* illic *minitetur* flocci fecerit.

M. G. 41, ut praeolat mihi *quod* tu *uelis.*

Pseud. 207, faciant aduersum eos *quod nolint.*

Phorm. 125, ut orbae *qui sint* genere proximi eis nubant.

intellego; Cato, R. R. 14, *sunt;* Amph. 879, *grauidast;* Aul. 251, *uis;* Bacch. 863, *publicat;* Cas. 107, *diperis;* Cas. 206, *lubet;* Cas. 239, *decent;* Asin. 256, *solent;* Curc. 34, *palamst;* M. G. 227, *sunt;* M. G. 1050, *cupit;* Pers. 74, *oppugnant;* Pers. 372, *licet;* Trin. 341, *uis;* Trin. 641, *promeres;* Phorm. 42, *habent;* Phorm. 533, *dandumst;* Hec. 674, *nolo;* Hec. 768, *opust;* Adel. 54, *faciunt;* Adel. 511, *potes.* Pacuu. 282, *rogo;* Turpil. 146, *uolo;* Accius, 509, *accolunt;* Cato, R. R. 23, *sunt;* Cur. 428, *peto;* Trin. 979, *uolo;* Andr. 825, *cupis;* M. G. 1229, *amo;* Pers. 293, *optas;* Rud. 1256, *est.*

Adel. 711, ne imprudens faciam forte *quod nolit,* sciens cauebo.

Trin. 211, non flocci faciunt dum illud *quod lubeat* sciant.

Andr. 306, quaeso . . . id uelis *quod possit.*

Curc. 29, ne id *quod ames* . . . tibi sit probro.

M. G. 1230, *quod cupiam* ne grauetur.

Rud. 874, ut id *quod quaerant* inueniant.

ubi. Eun. 537, amabo ut illuc transeas *ubi illast.*

cum. Hec. 385, *cum* orata eius *reminiscor* nequeo quin lacrumem; Merc. 178, *quom* malum *audiendumst* flagitas me ut eloquar.

Andr. 160, ut consumat nunc *quom* nil *obsint* doli.

M. G. 1342, nequeo quin fleam *quom* abs te *abeam.*

Bacch. 907, ut eum castigem *quom* haec facta ad hunc *faciat* modum.

dum. M. G. 595, ne *dum absum* sortitae fiat; M. G. 1317, *dat;* Rud. 123, *sudumst;* Adel. 312, *est;* Pseud. 922, *dormit;* Asin. 914, *litigant;* Asin. 531, *expectamus;* Andr. 556–7, *datur.*

Poen. 884, (metus) *dum* ero insidias *paritem* ne me perduim.

ut. Andr. 623, ut sumam supplicium *ut uolo;* Amph. 559, *sunt;* Amph. 982, *intellegis;* Cas. 158, *est;* Men. 861, *minatur;* Merc. 989, *uolt;* Phorm. 1020, *sunt.*

Capt. 343, alium misero—qui tua mandata ita *ut uelis* perferat.

quam. M. G. 1086, ne magis sim pulcher *quam sum;* Asin. 268, *Lubentiast;* Heaut. 681, *uolt;* M. G.

Pers. 237, nunquam exterebrabis, tu ut sis peior *quam ego siem.*

2, *solent;* Truc. 63, *sunt;* Men. 192, *impetrant;* Poen. 694, *solent;* Capt. 443, *sum.*

Hec. 729, ne minus hinc impetrem *quam possiem.*

quantum. Bacch. 348, ut conueniam *quantum potest;* Heaut. 645, *est;* Pseud. 938, *dignu's.*

Andr. 577, is mihi suadet nuptias *quantum queam* ut maturem.

quo. Pseud. 470, ut possint *quo uolo.*

2. BOTH VERBS ARE IN THE IMPERFECT TENSE.

qui. Eun. 574, ut essem *unaquacum cupiebam;* Epid. 47, mandauit ut fidicina *quam amabat* emeretur sibi.

Merc. 152, rupi currendo ut *quae scirem* scire tibi liceret.

Bacch. 788, orabat *quod* istic *esset* scriptum ut fieret.

Cist. 85, ut me *quem* ego *amarem* sineret cum eo uiuere.

quantum. Bacch. 674, occasio . . . fuit . . . ut *quantum uelles* tantum sumeres.

cum. Phorm. 733,[1] ut facerem egestas me impulit *quom scirem* infirmas nuptias hasce esse.

3. BOTH VERBS ARE IN THE PERFECT TENSE.

qui. M. G. 588, quin id adimatur ne id *quod uidit* uiderit; Poen. 951, *ueni;* Pers. 478, *credidi.*

M. G. 149, faciemus ut *quod uiderit* ne uiderit.

aliorsum atque. Eun. 82, uereor ne *aliorsum atque* ego *feci* acceperit.

M. G. 370, numquam deterrebor *quin* uiderim id *quod uiderim.*

4. THE GOVERNING VERB IN THE PRESENT TENSE WITH THE DEPENDENT VERB IN A DIFFERENT TENSE.

(*a*) *The dependent verb in the perfect tense.*

1) *The governing verb independent.*

Aul. 433, utinam auferam *quae tuli;* Poen. 193, hoc agamus quod *cepimus;* Truc. 9, *uentumst;* Men. 1104, *pollicitu's;* Men. 451, *commentust;* M. G. 1010, *sum agressa;* M. G. 1100, *instruxisti;*

Cato, R. R. 5, *quae dominus imperauerit* fiant.

Ibid. *quod* dominus *crediderit* exigat.

qui.

[1] The mood of scirem may be due to the adversative force of the clause.

Heaut. 31, *fecit;* Heaut. 745, *attulerunt;* M. G. 1127, *instruxisti;* Eun. 302, *remoratust;* Plaut. Frag. 21, and Aquilius. 1, *repperit;* Naeu. 19, *protulit.*

ut. Trin. 63, and Truc. 844, habeas *ut nactu's.*

cum. Poen. 208, *obtulisti.*

ubi. Cato, R. R. 7, *salutauit.*

2) *The governing verb dependent.*

qui. Amph. 291, *imperauit;* Amph. 948, *noui;* Aul. 278 *imperauit;* Capt. 515, *orauisti;* Cas. 503, *mandaui;* Cas. 512, *condiuit;* Men. 445, *imperatumst;* Men. 686, *commisi;* Men. 991, *imperaui;* Men. 1057, *fecisti;* Merc. 669, *fugit;* M. G. 949, *conduxi;* Pseud. 639, *missus sum;* Rud. 587, *potaui;* Trin. 1123, *egi;* Truc. 893, *perdidi;* Amph. 629, *imperaui;* Asin. 38, *locutu's;* Aul. 671, *fecit;* Curc. 272, *portentumst;* Curc. 433, *emi;* Bacch. 1020, *obiurigauit;* Men. 672, *dedi;* Curc. 464, *locaui;* Most. 416, *turbauimus;* Pers. 613, *iussit;* Trin. 141, *concreditumst;* Heaut. 1067, *fecit;* Hec. 54, *commisit.*

Phorm. 845, ut haec *quae contigerint* sciat.

Most. 413, *quae dissignata sint* . . . tranquille cuncta ut proueniant.

Trin. 1105, iubeto Sagarionem *quae imperauerim* curare ut efferantur.

Phorm. 272, non causam dico quin *quod meritus sit* ferat.

Heaut. 1040, ut serues *quod* labore *inuenerit.*

Poen. 7, ut . . . sedeant . . . *qui uenerint.*

quando. Trin. 616, *euortit.*

quam. Merc. 425, dum ne minoris uendas *quam emi;* Men. 1033, *fui.*

Rud. 1242, ut cum maiore dote abeat *quam aduenerit.*

ut and comparisons. Men. 1146, *ut iusti;* Pers. 616, *ut accepi.*

Naeu. 7, *ut est;* Pseud. 1020, *ut fuit;* Pacuuius 297, *ut ego egi, ago, axim;* M. G. 257, *exorsi sumus;* Phorm. 31, *usi sumus.*

(*b*) *The dependent verb in the imperfect or pluperfect tense.*

qui. Aul. 33, quo facilius ducat qui *compresserat;* Capt. 939, *reliqueram;* M. G. 132, *fuerat;* Men. 426, *dederam;* Cas. 514, *erat.*

ut. Andr. 543, *fuerant.*

quam. Capt. 247, *seruibas.*

5. THE GOVERNING VERB IN A PAST TENSE WITH THE DEPENDENT VERB IN A DIFFERENT TENSE.

(*a*) *The dependent verb in the present tense.*

qui. Andr. 583, ne faceres *quod* uolgus *solet;* Andr. 793, ut sciret *quae uolumus;* Bacch. 689, *loquar;* Pers. 433, *faciunt;* Phorm. 656, *debeo.*

ut. Eun. 93, *dolet;* Trin. 375, *repercis.* Merc. 427, *est.*

(*b*) *The dependent verb in the perfect tense.*

qui. Cas. 933, ut *quo ego bibi,* biberet; Merc. 230, ne noceret *quam habui;* M. G. 74, *consignaui;* M. G. 186, *uidit;* Pseud. 72, *sciui.*

quom. Rud. 498, *adduxisti.*

priusquam. Capt. 537, *periisti.*

(*c*) *The dependent verb in the pluperfect tense.*

qui. Capt. 720, ut melius consulerem tibi quam illi *quicum . . . exegeram.* Curc. 550, tuom qui signum ad me *attulisset* nuntium ne spernerem.

GROUP II.

IN WHICH THE MAIN VERB IS IN THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF DELIBERATION OR AN EXTENSION OF IT.

(*a*) *The main verb is a subjunctive of deliberation.*

qui. Hec. 445, quo pacto celem *quod* me orauit; Stich. 675, *habito;* Eun. 1046, *fuit;* M. G. 199, *uidit.*

(*b*) *The main verb is a subjunctive of "surprise, remonstrance, or indignation."*

cum. Eun, 47, non eam *quom accensor?*

[cf. p. 9. Most. 896, Heaut. 413–15; Hec. 341; Andr. 944; Bacch. 286; 1192; Trin. 733; Epid. 588; Men. 560–1; Bacch. 1190; Phorm. 970–2.]

ubi. Bacch. 66, penetrem *ubi desudascitur!*

qui. Asin. 94, Ten defrudam *quoi est!*[1] Asin. 885, *habet;* Men. 560, *domist;* Men. 763, *expetit;* Most. 301, *cupio?* Heaut. 784, *daturus sum;* Andr. 271, *credidit!* Adel. 677, *ueneram?*

Phorm. 970, ubi quae lubitum *fuerit* peregre feceris . . . uenias! cf. p. 7.

Merc. 702, em quoi tua *quae habeas* commendes uiro!

Most. 494,[2] mirum quin uigilanti diceret *qui . . . occisus foret.*

Pers. 340,[2] mirum quin regis Philippi causa . . . potius uendam quam mea *quae sis* mea.

Group III.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of "obligation or propriety."

qui.

(*a*) *Both verbs are in the present tense.*

M. G. 55, quid . . . dicam *quod* omnes *sciunt?* Phorm. 345, ea *qui praebet,* non hunc habeas . . . deum?

[See p. 10 and Hec. 658; Eun. 566; Amph. 434, etc.]

Hec. 760, meritus . . . est *quod queam* ut commodem.

Men. 1067, ut pigeat *quae uelis.*

Men. 1100, promeruisti ut nequid ores *quod uelis.*

[1] There are a great number of verbs in the subjunctive which correspond to this indicative, but since they are usually classed among the qui-causal and adversative subjunctives, I have omitted them. Cf. Amph. 434, quid ego ni negem qui egomet siem, and see footnote p. 8. What is here stated will also apply to the clauses of the same nature in the next group, no. III. In group II, I have not classified as regards tense, for reasons which have been given, p. 7.

[2] These may be qui-causal subjunctives.

quam. Eun. 75, ut redimas *quam queas* minimo . . . at *quanti queas.*

quom. Stich. 114, ut *quom ambulent* . . . os obturent.

Bacch. 139–42, non par uidetur neque sit consentaneum *quom* haec intus intus *sit* et cum amica *accubet quomque osculetur* et conuiuae alii *accubent* praesentibus illis paedagogus una ut siet.

ut. Asin. 49, cur filio suscenseam patres *ut faciunt* ceteri.

(*b*) *Both verbs are in the imperfect tense.*

qui. Hec. 230, quae hic *erant* curares; Poen. 391, *dicebas.*

(*c*) *The dependent verb is not in the same tense as the main verb.*

qui. Cas. 701, cur non impetrem *quod coepi;* Trin. 1024, *periit;* Most. 435, *uoluisti;* Rud. 1397, *sum iuratus;* Pers. 637, *fuit;* Aul. 222, *facis;* Phorm. 468, *domist.*

Group IV.

In which the main verb is in the potential subjunctive.

(*a*) *Both verbs are in the present tense.*

qui. Asin. 234, habeo unde *quod poscis* dem; M. G. 82, *uolt;* Heaut. 855, *opus sunt.* Capt. 937, lingua nullast qua negem *quidquid roges.*

ut. Epid. 445, *postulas.*

quam. M. G. 615, *tu's?*

dum. M. G. *dum ductant,* uideas.

(*b*) *The dependent verb not in the same tense as the main verb.*

qui. Merc. 175, *quaerebas?* Pers. 434, ut faceres *quod faciunt.*

unde. Epid. 115, *sumpsi.*

Group V.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of "ideal certainty."

(a) A verb in the present tense depending upon a "less vivid future" apodosis.

qui.	Curc. 82, istunc *qui fert* afflictum uelim; Capt. 237, *suadeo;* Pseud. 427, *gestant;* Poen. 971, *iubes;* Rud. 96, *mactat;* Truc. 349, *culpant;* Heaut. 642, *sciunt;* Hec. 794, *intellego;* Cas. 999, *dicitis.*	Cist. 497, *quodquomque optes* tibi uelim contingere.
		Cist. 97, si ames . . . *quam ames* consulas.
		Asin. 122, mauolet quam non reddat *quod promiserit.*
quam.	Aul. 493, mores meliores sibi parent *quam* nunc *ferunt;* Aul. 482–4, *utimur;* . . . *metuont* . . . *sumus;* M. G. 493, *facit.*	
quom.		Capt. 961,[1] quod ego fatear credin pudeat *quom autumes?*
		Eun. 863,[1] debeam . . . si id fecerim praesertim *quom* se seruom *fateatur!*

(b) Verbs in the present tense (if attracted, in the imperfect) depending upon verbs "contrary to fact in the present" (imperfect subjunctive).

dum.	Adel. 108, sineres illum facere *dum licet.*	Rud. 1261, *dum* . . . *censeret* . . . ipsus esset.
quam.	Phorm. 11, minus *quam nunc laedit* laederet; Bacch. 434, *quamst.*	Bacch. 488,[2] si uellem plus uiderem *quam deceret.*
quom.	Phorm. 208, *quom* hoc non *possum* illud minus *possem.*	Poen. 681, uidere uos uellem *quom* aurum *darem.*
qui.	Asin. 503, crederes . . . *quod fers;* Asin. 860, *facit;* Hec. 657, *intellego.*	

[1] I am not at all sure that we are right in placing subjunctives after cum-causal in the list of "attraction." The data are too meager to furnish trustworthy results; besides, the question is of no practical importance to classical Latin. Cf. p. 51. The habit of using that mood to express cause with *cum* may have had its beginning before the time of Terence. Besides, the examples here in question contain a strong suggestion of "remonstrance."

[2] Cf. p. 26.

(*c*) *Miscellaneous examples in which the two verbs refer to different time-spheres.*

qui. Heaut. 953, non auderet facere *quae fecit;* Adel, 314, *produxit;* Cist. 506, *dedi;* Most, 202, *dedi;* Truc. 349, *dedit;* Capt. 705, *dabam;* Eun.[1] 606, *simulabar.*

Group VI.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of assumption.

(*a*) *A verb in the present tense depending upon a "less vivid future condition."*

qui. Capt. 906, si memorem ea quae *conducunt;* M. G. 1429, *scio;* Rud. 978, *memoras;* Rud. 1021, *quoiust;* Trin. 470, *uocant;* Andr. 165, *uolo;* Phorm. 171, *mihist;* Pacuuius 407, euentura *sunt;* Pers. 393, *damus.*

quam. Truc. 324, *lauant.*

ut. Merc. 874, *properas;* Pers. 206, *digna's;* Stich. 112, *censeo.*

quo. Asin. 507, *praecipis.*

quantum. Lucil. 501, *petit.*

quom. Caecil. 174, *quom aduenis;* Cato. Frag. J. p. 58, *cum . . . iubet.*

Bacch. 778, ni . . . facta cupiam *quae* is *uelit.*

Trin. 472, siquid placeat quod congestum *siet.*

Rud. 1150, si tantillum peccassis *quod postules.*

(*b*) *A verb in a past tense depending upon a "less vivid future condition."*

qui. Capt. 417, si memores *quae . . . fecisti;* Bacch. 698, *dixit;* Merc. 419, *emptast;* Andr. 142, si illum obiurges *qui tulit;* Cist. 187, *uiderat.*

Capt. 205, si . . . solutos sinat *quos . . . emerit.*

Amph. 871, *quod contraxerim* si . . . expetat.

Curc. 269, si . . . uelint *qui periurauerint.*

Hec. 555, si is posset . . . *quacum consuesset.*

[1] In this sentence the verbs are in the same tense to be sure, but *essem* refers to the present, which of course *simulabar* does not.

(*c*) *Miscellaneous examples in which the two verbs are in different tenses.*

qui. Capt. 754, absque hoc esset *qui* hoc *fecit;* Trin. 967, *sunt* mortui.

Bacch. 564, nisi cum illa *quam mandassem* occiperes amare.

quantum. Pseud. 1236, *loquere.*

quam. M. G. 1083, *illest.*

Group VII.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of result or characteristic.

(*a*) *Both verbs are in the present tense.*

qui. Heaut. 76, ut cures ea *quae* nil *attinent;* Most. 396, ut facias *quod iubeo;* Eun. 396, *facio;* Andr. 390, *sunt certa;* Asin. 175, *uolt;* Curc. 66, *nullist.*

Most. 173, id euenit ut deceat quidquid *habeas.*

Merc. 1006, arbitri ut sint qui *praetereant.*

Merc. 840, ubi id eripiatur quod placeat.

Bacch. 352, ita feci . . . quantum *lubeat* reddere ut reddat.

Phorm. 153–4, ut *qui* . . . *uelit* patrem ut extimescam.

Amph. 824, absunt testes qui illud *quod dicam* adsentiant.

cum. Adel. 823, duo *cum idem faciunt* saepe ut possis dicere.

Aul. 791, tam parui preti *quom pudeat* quin purget.

ubi.

Asin. 945, tam ingenio duro quin *ubi* . . . *sit* faciat bene.

Phorm. 154, patrem ut extimescam *ubi ueniat.*

Hec. 608, qui *ubiquomque* opus *sit,* possit.

quam. Adel. 39, quid sit carius quam *ipse est* sibi.

quo. Pseud. 850, ut appareat *quo uenio.*

Eun. 554, qui me sequatur *quoquo eam.*

(*b*) *Both verbs in the imperfect tense.*

qui. Men. 20, ut non posset *quae* mammam *dabat;* Pers. 261, qui daret *quoius* ingenium *nouerat.*

Amph. 47, ut exprobraret . . . *quod faceret.*

Aul. 740, ut id *quod* non tuom *esset* tangeres.

quantum.

Bacch. 352, feci ut auri *quantum uellet* sumeret.

(*c*) *The dependent verb is not in the same tense as the main verb.*

qui.	Poen. 21, *qui dormierunt* decet . . . stent; Naeuius 58; *opus est.* Pers. 825, *faciebat.*	Capt. 467, nec uidi quoi minus procedat *quicquid* facere *occeperit.*
ut.	Hec. 150, *accepi;* Eun. 870, *studui.*	
quom.		Capt. 473, qui . . . *quom ederint* reddant domi. Trin. 621, quoi tuam quom rem *credideris* sine . . . cura dormias. M. G. 742, quin *ubi* triduom . . . *fuerit,* iam odiosus siet.
ubi.		Trin. 699, ut *ubi adstrinxeris* . . . atque *dederis* . . . nec *sit* . . . effugias.
quando.		Pseud. 725, qui *quando* principium *prehenderit* . . . teneat.
quocumque.		Hec. 859, ut uoluptati . . . aduentus tuos *quoquomque adueneris* . . . sit.

Group VIII.

In which the main verb is in the subjunctive of indirect question.

(*a*) *Both verbs are in the present tense.*

qui.	Asin. 27, quid sit *quod* scire *expetis* eloquere; Men. 972, *sunt;* M. G. 1012, *quaeris;* Pseud. 216, *loquor;* Pseud. 451, *renuntiant;* Trin. 257, *eget;* Naeuius, 60, *times.*	Cas. 572, adsitne ei . . . *quem aduocet.* Cato, R. R. 2, possitne quae reliqua *sint* conficere. Trin. 210, falsone an uero culpent *quem uelint.* Poen. 92, quid id sit hominis *quoi* Lyco nomen *siet.*
ut.	Aul. 800, *praedico;* Bacch. 400, *oportet.*	Trin. 306, utrum itane esse mauelit *ut* . . . *censeat an* . . . *ut* . . . *uelint.*

qui. (*b*) *Verbs in a past tense depending upon verbs in the same tense.*

M. G. 97, quo modo deuenerim . . . *quoi seruiui;* M. G. 345–6, utrum egon id *quod uidi* uiderim; Rud. 1310, *periit.*

Amph. 1016, exquirere quis fuerit *quem* propter *corpus* . . . *compleuerit.*

M. G. 261, qui fuerit . . . *qui sit* sectatus.

Mer. 623, quae facies foret *qui* illam *emisset.*

(*c*) *The dependent verb is not in the same tense as the main verb.*

qui. Amph. 106, quantus amator siet *quod complacitumst;* Curc. 630, *elusit;* Trin. 7, *abiit;* Hec. 732, *iussi;* Hec. 873, *feci;* Andr. 525, *dixit.*

Aul. 29, is scit quae sit *quam compresserit.*

ut. Aul. 65, *condidi.*

quam. Aul. 17, coepi obseruari ecqui maiorem filius mihi honorem haberet *quam* eius *habuisset* pater.

qui. Heaut. 2, *sunt.*

quom. Eun. 522, *perit.*

CHAPTER III.

The Uses of the Construction, Limitations.

Some of the conclusions to be drawn from these comparative lists are obvious. Mechanical attraction is of relatively rare occurrence in Early Latin. Even when the dependent verb is in the same tense as the governing clause, very little emphasis is needed to prevent assimilation. In fact, only about thirty-five per cent. of the verbs closely attached to a verb in the subjunctive are found in the same mood, and more than half of these belong to the class which seemed in the preceding discussion to be influenced to a great extent by the anticipatory subjunctive. It is impossible, however, to give absolutely accurate ratios, since, as will appear later, it is not often possible to fix in either class the verbs connected with conjunctions that may take either the indicative or the subjunctive. Such conjunctions are, for instance, *priusquam dum* and *si* in early Latin.

By a closer analysis of the lists of examples given above, we may discover to some extent the conditions under which the habit of attraction began to spread, or, the converse, the conditions under which the new construction did not thrive. The following conclusions are based not only upon the examples of mechanical attraction, but on the examples discussed in chap. I, as well; for it is obviously impossible to state in every case whether the subjunctive is entirely or merely in part due to the force of *mechanical* attraction.

1. The Time and Tense of the Dependent Clause.

The most important element is that of *time,* as has been implied by the classification itself. To be sure, this is not of equal importance in all constructions. So, for instance, attention has been called to the fact that a break in time-sphere does not affect the mood of clauses in dependence upon subjunctives of surprise, remonstrance, or indignation. Of course, conditional and independent

expressions of wish also present abnormal situations as regards tense. Tabulating the rest with reference to the time relationship which exists between the dependent and the governing verb, we find the following ratios of verbs *attracted* to those *not attracted:*

	Subjunctive.	*Indicative.*
Verbs in the future depending upon other verbs in the future[1] (pp. 16–24)	124	71
Other verbs depending upon verbs in the same time-sphere	10	10
Verbs in the present depending upon verbs in the future.	49	162
Verbs in the perfect depending upon verbs in the future..	16	64
Other verbs depending upon verbs *not* in the same time-sphere	2	27

2. The Position of the Dependent Clause.

The *position* of the dependent clause is also found to be a factor. A sentence may well open with a subordinate clause, even when the speaker's mind has not yet clearly given the exact shade of meaning to the main verb with which it is finally uttered. Thus in shaping a sentence like the following:

Rud. 485, Qui homo sese miserum et mendicum uolet,
Neptuno credat sese,

the mind may well have conceived the relative clause in entirety, before it had any definite feeling in regard to the main verb. In like manner the dependent clause may be forming when the main verb has already been uttered and its modal tone is growing indistinct, as may be the case in sentences like the following:

Lucil. 440, Ut ego effugiam quod te imprimis cupere apisci intellego.

Sometimes the dependent verb is attracted, though it precedes the main verb; very often when it follows. The favorite position, however, seems to be between the subjunctive verb and its introductory word, when this,—like ut, ne, etc., or any verb, like *persuadeo,* which calls for a subjunctive clause,—signals the approach of a subjunctive. A case in point is:

Andr. 424, I nunciam intro ne in mora *quom opus sit* sies.

[1] This term "future" refers, of course, not only to the future and future-perfect tenses, but also to many of the verbs in the present indicative and to very many verbs of the present subjunctive—especially those of the volitive subjunctive.

In sentences containing independent subjunctives, and in many conditional periods and in indirect questions, there is usually no possibility of a central position for a dependent clause, but the following table will show the relative importance, under normal conditions, of the three positions mentioned:

(When the dependent clause lies before the governing subjunctive and precedes all sign of its coming, it may be said to be in the *first position.* The *second position* is the central one just illustrated. The *third position* is that in which the clause lies after the governing verb.)

	1st Position.	*2d Position.*	*3d Position.*
Subjunctive	5	88	73
Indicative	34	87	138

It appears that the central position claims fifty-five per cent. of the attracted verbs, while only a third of those not attracted are in that place.

The dependent clause is occasionally found between the introductory conjunction and its verb, in conditional clauses like the following:

Pers. 206, si ut digna's faciant, odio hercle habeant,

and in imprecations and expressions of wish, as in:

Aul. 785, ut illum di immortales omnes deaeque quantumst perduint;

but instances of this kind are not very numerous. The data in regard to the position of verbs depending upon independent volitive and optative sentences and upon conditional clauses and clauses of ideal certainty are as follows:

	1st Position.	*2d Position.*	*3d Position.*
Subjunctive	23	15	24
Indicative	44	34	78

3. Precision in Tense and Modal Feeling.

When *precision* in certain respects is required, the dependent verb is seldom attracted.

(*a*) As regards *time,* the present subjunctive may stand for a present or a future indicative, and therefore is often of itself somewhat ambiguous. In the same way, the imperfect subjunctive may be confusing in that it represents an imperfect indicative or a future thrown into the past. It may be for the sake of avoid-

ing this possible ambiguity that the future indicative occurs in a few sentences like the following:

Bacch. 989, Volo ut quod iubebo facias.

and the present indicative in many sentences like this:

M. G. 1054, Age, . . . fiat quod *te oro.*

In the same way, the imperfect indicative (cupiebam) in the following prevents the interpretation of the verb as a past future of a generalizing clause, which would have been possible if the verb had become imperfect subjunctive by attraction:

Eun. 574, Ut essem una quacum cupiebam.

It is at least true that no verb in Early Latin is attracted if it is modified by a temporal adverb which refers to a time differing from that of the governing clause. Cf.:

Andr. 339, ubi inueniam Pamphilum
ut metum in quo *nunc* est adimam?

(*b*) Further, the indicative must obviously stand when precision in *modal* feeling is called for. So often does the tone of the governing clause penetrate to the dependent verb that the mind is continually expecting to find it there. In a great number of cases, though it is not definitely called for, it matters little if there is a shading of it; but often it is very essential to state a plain fact which is wholly devoid of the volitive, optative or conditional attitude of the governing verb. The terms "integral part" or "essential part" are ambiguous for the reason that they ignore considerations of this nature. A clause may be functionally an *integral part* of its sentence, and *essential* to its meaning without having its mood. On the other hand, if these terms are used with the understanding that they convey the modal and temporal feeling of the main sentence, such use ignores the fact of mechanical attraction. The following sentence will illustrate what I mean in speaking of precision in mood secured by the indicative:

Pers. 293, Di deaeque me omnes perdant—||
eueniant uolo tibi quae *optas.*

Quae optas refers definitely to the prayer just uttered. A subjunctive here would have been ambiguous, as it might have been equivalent to the above if attracted, or could have been understood as partaking of the optative nature of *eueniant,* or as conditional.

In fact both of these points are well illustrated by a number of sentences in which the contrast of *time* and of *modal* feeling is brought out by contrasting a subjunctive verb with the indicative of the same verb. See the following:

Trin. 351, Quod habes ne habeas et illuc quod non habes habeas.

Aul. 482, Et inuidia nos minore utamur quam utimur
Et illae malam rem metuant quam metuont magis
Et nos minore sumptu simus quam sumus.

(*c*) In fact, as any contrast necessarily calls for an explicit statement of the contrasted parts, wherever such a condition prevails there is less likelihood of attraction. So in the following there is a contrast between the subjects *tu* and *ego:*

Trin. 341, Non eo haec dico quin quae *tu uis ego uelim.*

A contrast of this kind may be brought out by some other word in the sentence, as by *pariter* in the following:

Cap. 329, Nunc hoc animum aduorte ut ea quae sentio *pariter* scias.

or by the tone of the context, as in the following:

Trin. 979, Dum ille *ne sis* quem ego esse *nolo.*

4. The Function of the Dependent Clause.

A comparison of the determinative with the generalizing clauses will prove that the readiness with which a verb is attracted depends to a great extent on the function of its clause as a part of the sentence. The determinative clause is necessarily precise in its statements. It aims at accuracy in the expression of its modal and temporal feeling, and is apt to possess a peculiar emphasis from this fact. In dependence upon a volitive or optative verb it is therefore likely, by remaining in the indicative, to deny that it partakes in any respect of the tone of the governing verb; and in subjunctive conditional sentences, where the Roman was so prone to cast the shadow of the ideal even over clauses which expressed facts generally known to be true, the determinative clause is much less frequently attracted than is the generalizing clause. Contrast, for example, the following, which is determinative:

Rud. 978, si *istuc* ius sit *quod memoras,* piscatores perierint,

with this, which is generalizing:

Bacch. 778, ni meum
Gnatum tam amem atque ei facta cupiam *quae* is *uelit* . . .
tua iam uirgis latera lacerentur.

An examination of the attracted verbs which refer to the present, while in dependence upon volitive, optative, potential, or conditional clauses in the present subjunctive, will show that even though they are determining rather than generalizing, and are to be interpreted as referring definitely to the present in connection with the events spoken of in the rest of the sentence in which they are found, they will, with but few exceptions, *allow* of an ideal interpretation which removes them from the sphere of a determined time or circumstance. They are of the type illustrated by the following:

Amph. 630, memor sum et diligens ut *quae imperes* compareant, in which, to be sure, *quae imperes* refers to the commands just being given, but may in a larger sense mean " whatever commands you give " or " shall give." So in M. G. 1230, (oro) *quod cupiam* ne grauetur, *quod cupiam* seems to refer to the wishes just expressed, but may here be conceived of as a part of a general prayer, " May not Venus begrudge my wishes! " Contrast the more definite statement:

Hec. 674, cogis *ea quae nolo* ut praesente hoc loquar.

My point then is that such clauses, while actually serving in their proper context as determinative clauses, are also given a form which suggests a general meaning of universal application, much as the universal presents in conditional sentences may be so expressed as to serve as such, while at the same time they adapt themselves to the feeling of the sentence in which they are found. Cf. Tusc. Disp., III, 35: Diceres aliquid et magno quidem philosopho dignum, si ea bona esse sentires, quae essent (*i. e., sunt*) homine dignissima.

5. The Temporal Versus the Relative Clauses.

The temporal clauses in Early Latin, when attached to a subjunctive, are found in the same mood more frequently in proportion to the number of occurrences, than the relative clauses under the same condition. There are a great number referring to the

future, of the nature discussed under the anticipatory, and we saw that these were as a rule subjunctive, if conditions were not unfavorable. This very fact would naturally give a strong impetus to attraction in the temporal clauses in particular. Before giving the general table, I would point out the more important habits of some of the individual temporal connectives.

Cum.—I have attributed the subjunctive with cum, eleven times to the inherent feeling of surprise, indignation, etc. (see pp. 8–11), three times to the necessities of its service as a past-future (see p. 12), forty-three times to its future force after a subjunctive (see pp. 16–21), ten times to a more mechanical attraction. After a subjunctive, the cum temporal clause has been found in the future indicative twelve times, in the present indicative seven times, and in the perfect indicative twice. We have found the verb with cum-causal attracted five times, and unattracted seven times; I would, however, call attention to the fact that the causal connection is not functionally a close one, as is seen in the case of the numerous loosely attached qui-causal clauses. Adding to this consideration the interesting fact that the quando-causal clause, out of fifteen opportunities, is not once attracted in Plautus and Terence, I would suggest that the word attraction must not be employed too frequently as a waste-basket, in attempting to remove troublesome subjunctive cum-clauses from Early Latin. The following verbs after cum I have classed with perfect subjunctives rather than future perfect indicatives after comparing their nature and position with those to which no doubt is attached:

Men. 543, ut te lubenter uideam quom ad nos ueneris.
Trin. 621, Capt. 434, Truc. 234, Capt. 473, Eun. 933, Hec. 694. The following, I think, are indicative: Cas. 130, Heaut. 557, Phorm. 185.

Quando.—This conjunction does not seem to be used in Terence as purely temporal.[1] The statistics which are found below regarding this conjunction apply, therefore, mainly to Plautus. As verbs after *quando-causal* are not found to be attracted, I have not even placed the non-attracted indicatives of this class in my tables, but for the sake of completeness give a list of them here: Capt. 12, Men. 834, M. G. 1269, Bacch. 445, Poen. 815, Rud.

[1] Cf. P. Scherer, De Particula Quando, Studemund Studien, II, p. 130.

1182, Adel. 877, Adel. 201, Adel. 287. In the following, which belong to the same class, the conjunction is quandoquidem: Mer. 170, Trin. 351, Trin. 991, Eun. 373, Andr. 487, Hec. 490. As *ubi* and the remaining temporal conjunctions show no marked peculiarities, it will be sufficient to refer to the table given below for the facts regarding them.

The following is a synopsis which will give as fairly as can be done the comparative frequency of attraction in the temporal and relative clauses. It summarizes the said clauses which are tabulated in the collections of pp. 16–44, omitting the clauses in which the causal or adversative force predominates.

	cum.	*ubi.*	*quando.*	*ut.*	*ubicumque utcumque. quotiens.*	*quam primum.*	*Total.*
Subjunctive	57	17	9		3	2	88
Indicative	22	13	6	2	2		45

Relative clauses.	
Subjunctive	104
Indicative	269

The proportion of subjunctives in these temporal clauses as compared with the subjunctives in relative clauses is thus seen to be about five to one.

A few words of explanation are also needed in regard to the behavior of the conjunctions commonly used with the anticipatory subjunctive.

Dum.—It is not within the scope of this paper to decide when dum takes the subjunctive because of its own force without regard to its position, and I have thought it sufficient to call attention to the fact that the mood of the main clause must be reckoned with, for which purpose I have tabulated the uses of dum in Early Latin with the present and future tenses.

		Indicative.		Subjunctive.	
		After indicative.	*After subjunctive.*	*After indicative.*	*After subjunctive.*
Dum = *while and as long as*	present	124	14	0	3
	future	17	0	2	9
= *until*	future	18	6	9	9

This table does not take into account clauses in indirect discourse or in dependence upon infinitives.

Of chief interest is the behavior of dum = until. After seeing how the indicative predominates after this conjunction, and that it

keeps six verbs out of attraction, it is impossible to say that all of the subjunctive examples are due to the regular habit of dum = until to take that mood. Since, however, it was impossible to call any of them undoubted instances of attraction, I have not admitted any of this kind into my tables in Chapter II. For the sake of completeness, I shall give a list here of the nine which are subjunctive and depend upon other subjunctives. They are: Cist. 782, M. G. 1249, Truc. 482, Andr. 980, Pseud. 1234, Curc. 526, Rud. 328, Rud. 1190, Trin. 757.

A rule is sometimes found in the handbooks stating that certain conjunctions which are used with both moods avoid attraction in order to prevent confusion, and that dum is one of these. A glance at the table will show that so far was Early Latin from thus distinguishing between dum = until and its other uses, that there are as many instances (14) of dum = while in the subjunctive as of the avoidance of attraction by the same particle. We have seen (p. 13) that all the evidence seems rather to point to a *survival* of an early anticipatory subjunctive use, even with this meaning, when the verb refers to the future.

Priusquam presents some of the same difficulties as dum, because even when it stands free, it takes the subjunctive at times. It is, however, safe to say that a just share of the subjunctives which are in dependence upon other verbs of that mood should be attributed to the growing habit of attraction, since priusquam in Early Latin, when standing free, takes the indicative far more frequently than the subjunctive. Priusquam does not seem to take the subjunctive in Terence.[1] I therefore feel safe in attributing the mood of Eun. 751 to the influence of the main verb. The passages in doubt are: Rud. 456, Men. 846, Mer. 1015, Aul. 154, Epid. 277, Truc. 523, Pseud. 1031, Bacch. 175, Trin. 886.

6. Adverbial versus Adjectival Clauses.

A further reason for the preponderance of the subjunctive in temporal clauses is that these are usually adverbial clauses and as such generally depend more closely upon the governing verb than do relative clauses, which are, as a rule, attached to the subject or object of the verb. Similarly, it is obvious that relative

[1] Cf. Lange, p. 36. Adel. 583 is an example of the second singular generalizing subjunctive.

clauses in dependence upon the object of the verb are more closely connected with that verb than those which are attached to the subject, and are in consequence more likely to be attracted, as is proved by the table hereto appended. This table includes only such examples as depend *directly* upon the subject, verb or object.

	In Dependence upon the Subject.	*Upon the Verb.*	*Upon the Object.*
Subjunctive	26	114	64
Indicative	60	70	122

Fifty-six per cent. of the subjunctives are in clauses which depend directly upon the verb, whereas but twenty-eight per cent. of the indicatives are in such clauses.

It is no doubt the failure to make this fundamental distinction which has led grammarians into the erroneous conclusion that the indicative is kept in "circumlocutions equivalent to a substantive," a statement which not only fails to give the real reason for the actual phenomena, but even misstates the facts in the case. A very considerable number of clauses of this kind are in fact attracted. See, for example, the following:

Men. 994, Caue quisquam quod illic minitetur nostrum flocci fecerit (quod minitetur = minas eius).

Eun. 1026, ut . . . faciam quod iubeat (quod iubeat = iussa eius).

Add to these Phorm. 125, Trin. 211, Bacch. 788, Trin. 715, Eun. 790 and many others. It is not true, therefore, that verbs of this kind are never attracted. However, the majority are not, and the real cause of this fact is that such clauses usually modify the subject or object of the sentence or modifiers of these, and are not, therefore, as closely bound up with the governing verb as the adverbial clauses are. In fact, the table just given shows that almost 70 per cent. of such clauses after subjunctive verbs remain in the indicative.

Some of the adverbial clauses present difficulties which call for a few words of explanation.

Si-clauses.—I have already spoken of the impossibility of making a satisfactory statement in regard to the conditional clauses, but it can at least be stated with certainty that the *si*-clause feels the influence of the mood of the apodosis. Rotheimer's[1] collection

[1] De enuntiatis condicionalibus Plautinis, 1876, pp. 42–7.

of the conditional sentences of Early Latin shows that when there is a question of mixed conditions, the si-clause is quite regularly in the subjunctive if the main clause is an apodosis of the regular type in the subjunctive. There are but thirteen exceptions, of which the following is an illustration:

Mer. 351, si dico ut res est . . . quem ad modum existumet me?

This fact becomes the more noteworthy when one finds that 129 exceptions occur in the converse type, which means that the principal clause of the conditional sentence is very often indicative though connected with a subjunctive protasis, as in:

M. G. 673, siquid sumas, sumptus est.

This contrast certainly points to assimilation of the protasis to the mood of the apodosis.

I find it impossible to be more explicit than this, and as it would be useless to attempt to decide in particular cases whether a si-clause is attracted or not, none of this class will be found in the tables.

The ut- and quam-clauses of comparison.—The ut-clause of comparison is sometimes said, in the hand-books, to avoid the mood used with *final-* and *consecutive-ut,* for the sake of clearness. It is true that though this is an adverbial clause, it is not often attracted; but I doubt whether the real cause of the fact is the reason given. This clause often precludes assimilation by its very nature, since, as has been pointed out (p. 49), comparisons and contrasts naturally tend to throw emphasis upon the verbs juxtaposed, which fact entails precision in expression of the modal and temporal force. Cf.:

Merc. 874, *si huc item properes* ut *istuc properas* facias rectius.

But this consideration is equally true of quam in comparisons and all other comparative and contrasting expressions. The following may represent a large group of this kind:

Truc. 324, si proinde amentur mulieres diu quam lauant.

Again, the next paragraph will show that many of these clauses, adverbial though they are, depend upon adjectives at a second remove from the verb of the governing clause. These two reasons will account for the fact that such clauses are not attracted as frequently as the other adverbial clauses.

In Early Latin the ut-clauses are found to be attracted four times and to avoid attraction twenty-five times. With quam in comparisons the ratio is 6 : 17.

7. The Proximity of the Dependent to the Governing Clause.

A minuter classification must now be made in order to determine how closely the dependent clause must be attached to the main body of the governing clause, in order to be attracted. It has appeared in the above that not only may those verbs be attracted which are found in adverbial clauses and in direct dependence upon the subjunctive verb, but also those which are attached to the subject or object of the same. In Early Latin this statement is not to be understood as applying to clauses after antecedents complete in themselves, which remain in the indicative (cf. Cato 84, uideto ut bene percocas medium, ubi altissimum est), nor to any of the loosely attached coordinate relative clauses, the "forward moving clauses," or parenthetical asides. It refers to the closely attached clause which is necessary to complete the meaning of the antecedent expressed or understood.

1. In Early Latin the relative clause, *when attached to the subject or attribute complement of the sentence,* is found to be attracted under the following conditions:

(*a*) When the antecedent of the relative is not expressed, as in Amph. 630, diligens ut quae imperes compareant (20 examples).

(*b*) When the antecedent is expressed and is a noun or substantive adjective, as in Most. 413, uiri doctist opus quae dissignata sint . . . tranquille cuncta ut proueniant (2 examples).

(*c*) When the antecedent is expressed and is a demonstrative pronoun,—is, ille, etc., as in Curc. 29, ne id quod ames . . . tibi sit probro (4 examples).

2. Similarly the relative clause when attached *to the object* of the verb is found to be attracted:

(*a*) When the antecedent is not expressed, as in Epid. 6, di dent quae uelis (41 examples).

(*b*) When the antecedent is expressed and is a noun, as in Cur. 550, tuom qui signum ad me attulisset nuntium ne spernerem (5 examples).

(*c*) When the antecedent is expressed and is a demonstrative pronoun. Cf. Lucil. 572, concedat id quod uelit (18 examples).

3. It may also be attached to the indirect object of the verb. Cf. Pseud. 570, det locum illi qui queat (5 examples).

4. Or to the object of a complementary infinitive depending upon the subjunctive verb, or forming its subject. Cf. Aul. 600, quod iubeat properet persequi; and Mer. 152, ut quae scirem scire actutum tibi liceret (5 examples).

5. Or to a substantive in an adverbial clause which modifies the predicate, as in Hec. 491, exopto ut relicuam uitam exigat cum eo uiro me qui sit fortunatior. So also Cist. 85.

6. As regards the adverbial clauses, the larger part of these

(*a*) (114) depend directly upon the governing verb, usually by means of a temporal conjunction, as in

Pseud. 307, quando nil sit, simul amare desinat.

We have already shown (p. 50) that this is the chief reason why so large a proportion of temporal clauses suffer attraction.

Furthermore, many adverbial clauses are attracted which are not directly attached to the verb, but

(*b*) depend upon some modifier of the subject, as

Pers. 237, Numquam . . . exterebrabis tu ut sis peior quam ego siem. Cf. Truc. 96.

(*c*) Or of the object. Cf. Hec. 729,

uidendumst ne minus propter iram hinc impetrem quam possiem. Cf. Pers. 340.

(*d*) Or which depend upon a second adverbial modifier of the predicate, as in Rud. 1243, ut cum maiore dote abeat quam aduenerit. Cf. Bacch. 488; Hec. 555; Aul. 17.

It is worthy of note that the last three classes contain for the most part adverbial clauses of comparison with quam, and that many of these clauses are of necessity far removed grammatically from the governing verb, and therefore remain in the indicative. On the other hand, it is readily seen that in a sentence like the last one cited (Rud. 1243) the dependent verb *aduenerit,* even though a second remove from *abeat* grammatically, is, in similarity of function and in position, very near to it; considerations which probably weigh as heavily as that of grammatical proximity in determining the mood of the verb.

Summary and Conclusion.

The first part of this paper makes an attempt (1) to explain the origin and (2) to describe the growth of the construction of modal attraction. (1) It endeavors to show that from several constructions (enumerated on p. 7) in which the dependent clause contained the modal force of the governing clause, the tendency arose which was the source of the construction of modal attraction. (2) It attempts to describe how this beginning developed by the law of analogy into a habit of placing dependent clauses in the subjunctive when attached to clauses of that mood.

The second part of the paper, after giving a complete list of the clauses in dependence upon subjunctives in early Latin, attempts to define the limits of the field into which the construction in question spread in that period, and to point out the obstacles which so limited it. This discussion shows with more definiteness than can be reproduced in a general statement, (1) that the attracted clause is preferably in the same time-sphere as the clause on which it depends; (2) that its favorite position is between the introductory conjunction (when such exists) and the verb of the governing clause; (3) that its verb rarely expresses precise modal and temporal force; (4) that the clause as a whole is rather of the generalizing than of the determinative type; (5) that it is more frequently a temporal than a relative clause; (6) that it is connected with the predicate more frequently than with the subject or object of the sentence, and (7) that, as a rule, it is an essential clause, and grammatically depends very closely upon the main body of the clause to which it is attached.

The above, I think, are practically all and the only statements of importance that can be made regarding the limitations of its uses in Early Latin. It is sometimes said[1] that under given conditions a clause is inevitably attracted. On the contrary, I believe that the comparative tables given above and the discussion of the same have made it evident that attraction is never abso-

[1] So for example Riemann et Goelzer (Gram. Comp., p. 724): *Cas où le subjonctif est obligatoire.*—Le subjonctif est *nécessaire* lorsque la proposition où il doit se trouver exprime une idée qui complète et achève l'expression de la pensée contenue dans la proposition infinitive ou subjonctive à laquelle elle se rattache. The sentence that he gives to illustrate this statement is an example, not of assimilation, but of Indirect Discourse.

lutely necessary. Practically every example of attraction was balanced by one or several non-attracted clauses which, so far as closeness of attachment is concerned, were of the same nature as the attracted clauses which they resembled.

These results may seem somewhat unsatisfactory in that no single short statement has been found adequate in defining the construction. However, a short definition may serve the pedagogical purposes of those who correctly understand the usages of the construction, and know the actual facts about its limitations as I have tried to present them in the preceding. A rule may be formulated somewhat as follows: When a clause depending upon a subjunctive clause forms an essential part of the thought of the governing clause, it may be put in the subjunctive. In this rule, however, the word "essential" must be interpreted in the light of all of the preceding discussion; and it must be remembered that the probability of the assimilation of a clause varies with its success or non-success in complying with the qualifications herein enumerated. These are quite tangible, and, as we have seen, lend themselves readily to definite, statistical treatment. To one who understands these the study may bring satisfactory results.

Finally I would protest against the common custom of treating this construction as a kind of Indirect Discourse. This error is probably due to the fact that the two constructions behave in much the same way, and are to a certain extent affected by the same limitations. It is also true that one often finds it difficult, not to say impossible, to decide whether a verb is influenced by one or the other, or by both. We have seen, however, that there is very little in common between them. Their origins are widely separated, and any grammar that purports to be historical should treat them separately.

Again, the construction of assimilation should be carefully distinguished from that which occurs after an infinitive. The two have in many particulars the same beginnings, they have practically the same habits, but the latter is more closely allied to that of Indirect Discourse than the former, and is of rarer occurrence.